Vital problems of religion,

201 C663v 114322

Cohu, John Rougier.
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

DATE DUE

201
C663v

Cohu, John Rougier
Vital problems of religion

LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773

DEMCO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-ATO-279

VITAL PROBLEMS OF RELIGION

BY THE

REV. J. R. COHU

Rector of Aston Clinton
Sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford

AUTHOR OF
"THE OLD TESTAMENT", "THE GOSPELS", AND "S. PAUL"
IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH;
"THROUGH EVOLUTION TO THE LIVING GOD"; "OUR FATHER";
"THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT"

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF S. ASAPH

"THOU hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless
until it find its rest in Thee."

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1914

Printed by

MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

663v

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND

ALFRED GEORGE EDWARDS, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF S. ASAPH,

I DEDICATE THIS BOOK

AS A TOKEN

OF

ESTEEM AND GRATITUDE

022978

A FOREWORD

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF S. ASAPH, D.D.

I HAVE had the valued privilege of reading *Vital Problems of Religion* in manuscript. I have rarely read a book of such sustained interest, at once so arresting and so informing.

If the problems discussed are old, their treatment in these pages is new. Difficult though it may be to find, for all the questions raised, answers which satisfy conscience without shocking reason, it may be fairly claimed for the author of these pages that he has successfully made his effort, and has shown an earnest desire to meet the increased severity of proof demanded by the modern critical spirit.

These vital problems confront and must be met anew by every generation. Fresh light is being thrown on them from many and different quarters, new methods are employed in their solution.

Mr. Cohu has dealt with these problems with soberness, courage, and knowledge. He has not been afraid to face the facts as they present themselves to-day; he has brought to bear upon his task the best and the most accurate knowledge; his style is singularly vivid and original, and there is not a dull page in the book.

The book is a sincere and earnest attempt to get at the inner essence of things, and I trust it will command, as it deserves to do, the attention of all those who desire to satisfy the questionings of the intellect on these vital matters.

A. G. ASAPH.

THE PALACE, S. ASAPH,
1st September 1913.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

AN intended preface has grown into an introductory chapter, and leaves little to be added here.

Some apology is due for an ambitious title. "Grounds of Faith," or "Grounds of Belief," would be more appropriate; but both are already monopolised. The present title I owe to the happy suggestion of my publishers, and I trust the text will justify it.

It is questionable policy to forestall criticism; but we are sure to be told: "There is little or nothing new in these pages." I make no pretension to such originality in a subject which has absorbed the greatest minds of all ages. Yet these chapters may have some value of their own, if only on the score of simplicity and earnestness of purpose. There is also much truth in F. D. Maurice's words: "Originality consists, not in thinking differently

from other people, but in thinking out for yourself what others have already thought more deeply; the original man is he, not who invents or refuses to learn from others, but who does not take words or phrases at second-hand without asking what they signify." In this spirit, my one aim is to examine, in the light of the best available modern thought from whatever quarter it may come, the vital problems underlying our spiritual experience, and to see how far such thought helps us to their answer.

Some of the views in these pages will be labelled broad, optimistic, impressionist; but a writer can only rise to the level of his own convictions. It may also seem strange that, in weighing the evidence for the reality and nature of God, comparatively little stress is laid on "the supreme personal proof of God," Jesus of Nazareth, "in Whose Face we have the light of the knowledge of the Glory of God" (2 Cor. iv. 6). The reason is obvious. In a book whose one aim is to show that "Religion is Reason not aware of itself that it is reason," all appeals to the Bible or Christianity are necessarily ruled out of court, except by way of illustration.

As a matter of fact, Jesus looms large in these pages, as a glance at the index will show. Personality is our key to the universe, and the knowledge of personality in God and man is all but impossible

without a knowledge of the Man Who "claims God-Sonship for Himself, that He may claim it for man" (E. Caird).

I have tried to curb two defects[1] to which my native tongue and my profession make me peculiarly liable, viz. Gallicisms and the "warm glow of the preacher's rhetoric." They are still there.

J. R. COHU.

ASTON CLINTON, 1913.

P.S.—As this MS. was going to press, the British Association Address was delivered. It voices so aptly much of what I wish to say in this book that I have, at the last moment, hastily jotted down footnote references to it here and there, marked B. A. A. for brevity.

J. R. C.

[1] "Frequent repetitions" I could not avoid. Where all my conclusions flow from one main principle, they are inevitable, and I make no apology for sacrificing form and brevity to lucidity. Another reason, "Of the making of many books there is no end, etc."; and reviewers and others seldom read from cover to cover. Small blame to them! Each chapter must therefore be as complete in itself as can be.

CONTENTS

CHAP. PAGE

I. INTRODUCTORY 1

Through scientific doubt to religious conviction.

II. THROUGH NATURE TO NATURE'S GOD,—OR, THE EVOLUTION STORY . . . 32

"There is nothing between absolute scientific belief in a creative directive Power and the acceptance of the theory of the fortuitous concourse of atoms" (KELVIN).

III. THE PROBLEM OF EVIL 62

Isaiah's paradox, "I, the Lord, create evil," in the light of to-day.

IV. RELIGION AND SCIENCE 92

Science grasps neither "things" nor "mind"; Religion probes both.

V. PERSONALITY IN MAN 126

"There is an immortal centre in us all, where Truth abides in fulness."

VI. THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL . . . 156

"Our wills are ours to make them Thine."

CONTENTS

CHAP. PAGE

VII. CONSCIENCE, OR GOD'S VOICE WITHIN US . 195

"Take all in a word: the truth in God's breast
Lies trace for trace upon ours impressed;
Though He is so bright and we so dim,
We are made in His image to witness Him."

VIII. RELIGION AND THEOLOGY . . . 213

Heart-experience, and its articulate expression in terms of thought.

IX. PHILOSOPHY'S LIVING PERSONAL GOD — FATHER, SON, AND HOLY SPIRIT—A PHILOSOPHIC CREED 247

Can the cold thought of Philosophy be translated into the warm speech of Religion?

VITAL PROBLEMS OF RELIGION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

A

SOMEONE has said, rhetorically yet truly: "S. Thomas is the patron saint of our age. The inquisitive finger of that experimental philosopher has multiplied itself into a thousand implements of research, challenging all mysteries, weighing all things in heaven and earth as in a balance, and sifting through its prisms and spectroscopes the light that comes from the throne of the Eternal."[1]

In plain English, this is an age of scientific investigation, analysis and verification, of hard,

[1] Cf. B. A. A. on the 'fundamental scepticism' of science, and its 'dogmatic denials and exaggerations.'

prosaic matter-of-fact. Everything is put on its trial and nothing is accepted on bare authority, or accepted at all, till it has been weighed, measured, counted, analysed and scientifically overhauled. It is the age of the chemist and statistician, not of the poet or seer, an age of fact and not ideals, of ratiocination and not inspiration, of hard spade-work and little originality. "There is no open vision."

Such is the temper of our age; and its historical method is like unto it. 'Back to facts,' 'Back to history,' are the watchwords of this method. It starts from Descartes' principle of unlimited doubt and takes nothing for granted. It insists on a minute elaboration of verified detail, the citation of chapter and verse for every statement, a verification of evidence more stringent than in a law-court. All the artistic, reflective, or romantic setting of classical days it brushes aside with impatient hands as the cobweb embellishments of the idealist or impressionist, whom it eyes with caustic disfavour as visionaries and truth-distorters. True to its character, this historical method subjects everything to a fierce search-light of criticism. It has laid bare the foundations of knowledge in its every branch, so as to gauge the real nature and worth of the information each department professes to give us, and to discover if this profession is actually borne out.

This S. Thomas scientific temper and method have undoubtedly borne good fruits. In every department of knowledge we now have a solid body of sifted and verified truths; still better, we have learnt to be fearlessly honest and sincere, intolerant of loose statement or careless conjecture.

Confessedly, S. Thomas is the patron saint of our age. The peace in believing which belonged to other ages is not for us. Even the Divinity of Christ is questioned. "Again Thy wounds are opened to see whether it is the blood of one like ourselves, or of a God, which flows from them."[1] In place of the unquestioning faith of simpler-hearted earlier generations, the spirit of our time commands us to try all things. Escape from this temper of mind we cannot; it is now a second nature.

Naturally, when our knowledge in other spheres is so rigorously tested, theology cannot hope to be exempt. Our Bible and creeds and Church-institutions must also be put on their trial, court every kind of investigation, establish their claims. Men now thoroughly in earnest will have no opinions, on bare authority, which reason cannot endorse and convert into convictions.

[1] *e.g.* see "Jesus or Christ" controversy in *Hibbert Journal.* Supplement (1909).

We may decry, but not ignore, this spirit of Modernism. It has come to stay. And it is of no earthly use to tell Science: "Hands off our Holy of Holies!" Science claims every field of knowledge, sacred or profane, as her own and is already in possession. For years she has investigated such questions as the origin and growth of religions, the Creation of the Universe, the origin of life, the history of national Bibles, the nature and evolution of the religious and moral sense, the origin of evil, the rise of ecclesiastical creeds and rites. In the interests of knowledge and truth and man, she means to go on investigating them whether religious people like it or not.

To sensitive religious minds, there may seem more than a touch of profanity in this cold way of handling and prying into our most cherished beliefs and hopes. Yet Religion's truest friends are they who neither ask nor wish criticism to pause or stay its hand even before the innermost shrine of our Christian Faith. This would argue a weak faith, an unworthy fear lest Christianity should not be true or strong enough to stand the test of searching Truth.

And why should we fear criticism, if it be honest? Its one aim is to get at facts. Why should we fear science? Surely, the God Who dwells and speaks in our hearts and the God Who dwells

and speaks in Nature is one and the same God, Who does not speak with two voices. "Have faith in criticism, have faith in science, and have faith in God," said Bishop Westcott. Gamaliel said the same thing two thousand years ago: "Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if their counsel or work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

History bears out both Westcott and Gamaliel. Over and over again, face to face with science, has Religion seemed to be on the losing side, yet it has always come out of the struggle all the stronger and purer. After the event, we have seen that it was not the Christian Faith that was being put on its trial, but *we* that were being tested by our Faith.

A few concrete instances of scientific discoveries which "gave the religious world furiously to think" may illustrate our point. The story is old and familiar, time has withered most of the romance out of it, but the value of the object-lesson never fades.

There was Copernicus' heliocentric discovery of four hundred years ago. Think of the dismay it created in pious minds at the time! At one stroke it ran full tilt against the Bible, dethroned man's earth from its proud position at the hub of the universe, making it and man on it mere infinitesimal

specks, thus apparently lessening man's claims upon God's regard. Well might the orthodox pour the vials of their indignation upon Copernicus and Galileo after him.

Some two centuries later, religious hearts were again plied with obstinate questionings by the discovery of the Uniformity of Nature and the universal Reign of Law. This shattered another ecclesiastical idol. If Law reigns supreme, asked divines and Hume alike, where do miracles come in? How can Providence intervene in Nature or in the affairs of men?

Darwin's evolution-theory next shook the religious world. Man, leaning on Genesis, had believed himself akin to God; Darwinism proclaimed him but a developed ape.

Worse was still to come. Even fifty years ago, nine-tenths of the orthodox paid little heed to physicists or biologists and their 'atheistic' fads. "It is written," was then an unanswerable plea. In those days of firm belief in a verbally inspired Bible, it was easy for the Church to rally the faithful round her, calm their fears, and turn the tables on science by an appeal to Scripture and a suggestion to the 'cobbler to stick to his last.' But it became a far more serious matter when the attack on official theology and on the Bible itself came from those of

the Church's own household, and she was 'wounded in the house of her friends.' The scientific temper of the age and its historical method had actually found their way into the theological camp itself.[1] Amid storms of angry protest, the infallibility of the Bible and the authenticity of many of its books were called in question, and its claims to rank as the final court of appeal in matters of history and science were proved untenable.

In their day, the heliocentric theory, the Reign of Law, Evolution, and Bible criticism,—now household words,[2]—were all denounced as blasphemous and absolutely subversive of God's Word and His Religion. Yet what had these scientists done thus to be anathematised and to create such dismay and rancour in the religious world? They had not put a single new fact into either Nature or Bible, so as to make either the one or the other in any way different from what it was before. Copernicus did not make the Earth revolve round the Sun. Science did not thrust the Reign of Law upon Nature. Darwin did not make man evolve physiologically from the chimpanzee. The human element was in

[1] e.g. *Essays and Reviews*, with Dr. Temple as a contributor; and *Lux Mundi* with Dr. Gore as editor.

[2] Cf. Agassiz's *mot* anent the three stages through which scientific discoveries have to pass: (1) It is false; (2) It is contrary to religion; (3) We knew it all along.

the Bible before Higher Critics found it there. All that the scientific examination of Nature or the Bible did, was to give us eyes to see what was there all along. It simply gave men a clear and intelligible sketch of how God works in Nature and speaks to us in the Bible.

And, all said and done, what harm has it done to Religion? Has Faith suffered? Has the Copernican discovery made man of less account in God's eyes? Has the Reign of Law shattered our faith in the quickening, sustaining, directing Providence of God? Has evolution robbed man of his kinship with God? Has the Higher Criticism taken away our Bible? Has it not rather given us a Bible more intelligible, more spiritual, more helpful, more jealous of God's honour than ever before?

Very far from our Faith having suffered by our increased knowledge of Nature and the Bible, there has been a positive enrichment of our true knowledge of God and His ways. As already said, it was not our Faith that was being put on its trial, it was we that were being tested by our Faith. God was educating us in it all, exactly as He educated Job of old. Something was wrong, something was holding our eyes so that we could not see as God wanted and meant us to see. God wanted that beam removed from our eyes. What was it?

B

What was wrong with us? If these scientific discoveries simply unveiled God's methods, why did eminent and saintly divines denounce their authors in words of abuse painful to read and painful to hear fall from Christian lips? Why all this religious alarm and indignation?

All this outcry was the outcome of hearts holy and sincere, jealous for the honour of their God, and in the best interests of Religion, Truth, and man. The Bible and Creeds were at stake, and, in their eyes, the Bible was God's actual Word, while the creeds were identical with Religion. Hence all this new scientific teaching, contradicting both Bible and creed, was nothing short of damnable heresy to be stamped out as a deadly plague, if Religion and mankind were to be saved from the poison of its contagion. It was an issue of life and death, a time for no half-measures or parley. The Church must give a clear trumpet-call to the faithful and hurl a challenge of defiance in the teeth of the foe. "For God and His Bible!" "Contend for the Faith once for all delivered to the saints!" were her rallying cries, and by fair means or foul these pestilent scientific anarchists must be annihilated. The Church appealed to the highest in men, and the

lowest. Popular prejudices, abuse, sarcasm, persecution were pressed into her service. Even as persecuting Paul of old, she did it in all good conscience, thinking she was doing God service.

Paul of old was wrong and the Church was wrong, and for the same reason. History ever repeats itself. The Church was making exactly the same mistake as the orthodox Jewish Church of our Lord's day, and Paul before his conversion. All three identified official theology with Religion, and the Bible with God's actual Word. In their mistaken zeal for God, they made a fetish of their traditional theology and forgot that, in the course of centuries, it had picked up endless "traditions of men which made the Word of God of none effect." In their zeal for God, again, they deified the Bible and accused its critics of blasphemy, forgetting that exactly the same charge had been levelled at our Lord's criticism of the Old Testament when He said: "It hath been said by them of old, but I say unto you."

The exaltation of traditional theology and of the letter of the Bible into a fetish, this was the beam blinding men's eyes to God's new light, when it poured upon them from sources outside the Scriptures or their Prayer-book. This was the fertile cause of religious panic and indignation, whenever science proclaimed any new truth not

squaring with the views of official creeds. The same reactionary ecclesiastical spirit is with us to-day, and explains why theology ever lags behind the best thought of its age and is ever in distress.

We have no wish to speak slightingly of theology. In some circles it has a bad name as the mere dry bones of Religion, whereas it is its living flesh and bone and nerve and sinew. As thinking men, we cannot do without theology and live a true spiritual life. Theology is Religion reflecting upon itself, and a heart full of the Spirit of God cannot but give some articulate expression to its heart-thoughts. This is all we mean by a theology or a creed in its true sense. Christ deliberately committed Himself to a creed when He called God 'Father'; and the Sermon on the Mount and the High-Priestly prayer in 'S. John' are theology pure and simple. Just because Christ wants all of us to have heart-convictions, to think out our religion, to get at the heart of the matter for ourselves as He did, He wants us to have a definite creed of our own. His vital question to the Twelve: "But Whom say *ye* that I am?" and His emphatic blessing on S. Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God," prove it up to the hilt.

As a matter of fact we all theologise. We cannot

help asking ourselves: Why am I here? What comes after death? Does chance rule all things, or is there a purpose in it all? And our answers to these questions are our theology or creed. The 'man in the street'—Christian or agnostic—is a theologian, just because he is face to face with the facts of life and its mysteries. His mind is a busy workshop of views on these problems, and he is constantly shaping and reshaping his creed in his own fashion. Theologise we all do and must. The only question is whether we do it on right or wrong lines, and whether our creed is made up of definite convictions, thin abstractions, or a mere note of interrogation.

Without theology there is no Religion. But there is theology and theology. One is Religion's rival, the other Religion's hand-maiden. There is a theology which is the outcome of a personal heart-experience, and there is a theology which makes assent to the formulas of the fourth and sixteenth centuries the test of a man's acceptance with God, thus substituting an intellectual judgment for a soul-attitude or personal heart-experience. The two are as wide apart as the poles. To be a child of God is not an intellectual assent to His Godhead and Fatherhood, but to walk with Him as a child walks with a father whom he loves and trusts. So

of every article of our creed; it must stand for a personal heart-experience. No mental assent to a form of words can do duty for heart-convictions.

> "Though Christ a thousand times be born in Bethlehem,
> If He's not born in thee, thy soul is all forlorn;
> The Cross of Golgotha thou lookest to in vain,
> Unless within thyself it be set up again."

Of course, we do not stand for pure individualism in matters of belief, or deny to a Church the right to formulate the great positive truths and principles it collectively represents. Far from it. No doubt, Christ's conception of the perfect Church with its Religion of the Spirit (Jn. iv. 23 sq.) is our noblest conception of a Church, but the time for it is not yet. Only rare mystic souls here and there can attain unto this splendid ideal. We ordinary men need a visible Church with its rites and sacraments, its forms and symbols, and, whatever S. John may say, Christ Himself provided for that want in His Sacraments. And if a strong and living Church is to lead and inspire men, she must give them clear marching orders, a creed definite and authoritative. She must uncompromisingly say: "Thus saith the Lord." Voicing the deepest convictions and highest aspirations of her day in accents clear and loud, she must breathe an unmistakable and even defiant challenge to the armies of sin, error, doubt. Thus

alone will her rank and file rally around her as one man, assured that her life-and-death battle is their battle, and that their ultimatum has been issued and there is to be no thought of compromise.

But let the Church be sure that her creed *is* a "Thus saith the Lord," in line with the spirit, aims and principles of Christ Himself. Let her also see to it that her creed is disburdened of all dead values and represents God's Truth as men see it now, not in the light of four hundred or a thousand years ago, an old light which is often no light to us now, but only darkness. In a word, let her see to it that what she stands for is worth defending, and that she is not draining her own and her faithful soldiers' best energies in protecting "a huge baggage-train, containing much that is essential, but also packed with obsolete munitions, uneatable food, and a mixed assortment of worldly goods," while she in the meantime is losing sight of the real objective.

C

If Theology and Religion, the Bible and God's Word, are not one and the same thing, what then is the true relationship between them? Chap. VIII. § *B.* fully enters into this question, and we need only apply its conclusions here.

Religion and Theology.—Definitions are always troublesome, and Religion is the most troublesome of words to define. It has to cover every shade and grade of soul-attitude, from palæolithic man's thrill of shudder in the presence of earthquakes and primeval-forest dangers, right up to the heart-experience of a Christ. And for the religious sense to awaken, either in savage or philosopher, all that is needed is to be alive to the facts and mysteries of life. In the presence of an immense Universe, evil and death,[1] the same religious shudder thrills savage and philosopher alike, and forces a sigh which is the birth of prayer. "Out of the deep I cried unto Thee, and Thou heardest me."

Religion is the outcome of this sense of awe in man's heart, prompting him to be on friendly terms with a Power which can help or hurt him. This awe has passed through many phases. Fear first was uppermost, and man stood as abject slave to a jealous vindictive despot of a god. He next learnt to view God as a righteous King. Christ has now taught man to know God as a Father whose love never changes; a Love sin cannot lessen, for the sinner needs it all the more; a Love Christ's coming

[1] Cf. M'Taggart's definition: "Religion is an emotion based on a conviction of a harmony between ourselves and the universe."

did not increase, only brought home clearly to our hearts by incarnating it.[1]

Religion, then, is essentially a soul-attitude, a personal heart-experience, a personal walk with God. It is the warm feeling of a close living touch, an at-one-ness with God, which fills and thrills the whole man, mind and heart and will, so that he cries: "My Lord and my God!"

Theology is the attempt to formulate this heart-experience in human language, to express it in the words and ideas of the day, so that heart may speak to heart for mutual edification and instruction.

All language is, at best, but a crude and cumbersome vehicle to express unutterable heart-emotions and heart-thoughts. As Christ's example shows, the only language in which heart-truths can find any real self-expression is the word-picture speech of poetry, parable, myth, *e.g.*, "I am the Way, the Truth, the Life, the Light of the World, the Bread of Life." Define and develop these fluid and elastic word-pictures into logical propositions, and all their wealth of suggestiveness evaporates, while

[1] The ideas of God's Fatherhood, the sonship and brotherhood of man, the forgiveness of sin, were not new, but Christ's Personality gave them a life and efficacy they never had before, made them working forces in the world. "Ideas are helpless till personality lends them wings."

the new cast-iron definitions open the way to endless error and hair-splitting.

For instance, theologians have taken Christ's inspiring word-pictures, 'Father,' 'Son,' 'Holy Spirit,' and slavishly and literally dissected and analysed them, beclouded their immense suggestiveness and squeezed all the life out of them with their minute abstract definitions, and given us in an Athanasian Creed a series of absolutely incomprehensible and debatable doctrinal propositions to be believed on pain of damnation! They have taken Christ's picture of 'Father' and 'Son,' elaborated a speculative theory of the way in which the divine and human natures dovetail in one Christ, and ended by mystifying themselves and us all with a twofold nature which never blends in the unity of the Person.[1]

We know that this defining of the indefinable, this crystallising of the living Faith into dogma, was forced upon the Councils, and had to be done to combat this and that heresy which was draining the life-blood of Christianity. These dogmas sprung from a living Church, true to her mission to watch

[1] S. John, with his 'The Word was made Flesh,' gave theology the one true key to the mystery of the God-man. Greek theology took John's key, found it fitted all the wards of the lock, and partly opened the door. Latin theology promptly slammed back the door, and covered it with cobwebs of error spun by the well-meaning but dull brains of a long series of schoolmen.

over the souls of men and guide their minds through the confusion and darkness of error and ignorance into the light of the truth committed to her keeping. She boldly faced the crisis of that day and met its actual needs and experiences. The enemy was battering at the gate. An inspiring word was wanted to confirm the loyalty and sustain the courage of the defending host. A strong and living Church spoke that word clearly and authoritatively. Precisely because its formulas exactly reflected the limitations as well as the better and more lasting features of the time, the trumpet-call was clear and gave no uncertain sound. No wonder men responded to that call and prepared themselves for battle.

So in Reformation days. There again we see a strong and living Church come boldly forward, as the leader and inspirer of men, and carry them with her as one man. Why? Because in her formulas she exactly voices the needs and aspirations of the day, is fighting its battle, and issues her words of command in language men fully grasp and endorse. In their day, the watchwords of the Reformers were full of glow and life;[1] no wonder they stirred the souls and stiffened the allegiance of men then.

[1] Cf. Sabatier: "Dogmas may be as dead to-day as blocks of cold lava; trace them back to their source and you will see them as the glowing outpourings of an intense internal fire."

Our quarrel is not with the formulas of the Councils, or Reformers, or even with the generation that gave us the Athanasian Creed. It is with our Church to-day for not catching their spirit and doing what these strong and good men did, and as bravely as they did it. In the face of a desperate crisis, the Patristic Church was forced to face the whole situation from a new standpoint which gave a totally different outlook on many points from that of the primitive Church. They achieved their difficult task to perfection, so far as the needs of their age went. The Reformers did exactly the same thing. So as to bring their theology into closer harmony with the new needs and aspirations of their day, they were not afraid to alter the old theology, disburden it of its dead values, absorb new light, new forces, new elements.

This is what a strong and living Church has done in the past and must do now as of old, if she is to be God's living witness to men. She must stand boldly forward as a leader and inspirer of men, meet their deepest needs and voice their highest aspirations, be abreast and not astern of the best light and thought of her day, speak in the living words and ideas of her own generation and not of a long dead past.

The Church was never meant to be the timid echo and pale copy of the religious thought and life of

the past. It is one thing to honour the magnificent handiwork of strong Christian generations, quite another to worship it as a fetish. Yet here we are trying to live in a world of antiquated theology with which we are absolutely out of touch. Since the days of the Councils, or even of the Reformation, changes too vast for easy description have taken place in the world. We look on a different landscape, we breathe a different atmosphere. An enormous mass of new light has given us a new knowledge of Nature, a new Bible, a new and deeper conception of God; theory has given way to fact, evolution has given us a new perspective, religion and philosophy speak a new tongue. A wide gulf separates us from the fourth and sixteenth centuries. Why should we go on for ever binding their phylacteries to our foreheads?[1] Their dogmas satisfied the needs of their generation; let our Church satisfy our deeper needs to-day. Westcott is right: "No formula which expresses clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the generation that follows;"—and again: "Let us thank

[1] Cf. Wm. James: "The theological machinery that spoke so livingly to our ancestors, with its finite age of the world, its creation out of nothing, its juridical morality and eschatology, its relish for rewards and punishments, its treatment of God as an external contriver, sounds as odd to most of us as if it were some outlandish savage religion." Cf. Pfleiderer, *Christian Origins*, pp. 9–10 in English translation.

God that He has called us to unfold a growing message, not to rehearse a stereotyped tradition."

When men exclaim, "Contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints," they forget that in every dogma there is (1) an inner experience or soul-attitude which never alters, (2) an intellectual or philosophical element which ever changes. "Theology is the marriage of an immortal (=religion) with a mortal (=philosophy); the religion lives for ever, the philosophy grows old and dies. When the philosophic element of a religious system becomes antiquated, its explanations which contented one age become unsatisfactory to the next, and there ensues what is spoken of as a conflict between religion and science, whereas, in reality, it is a conflict between the science of one generation and that of the succeeding one" (Dr. G. Salmon).

Every dogma bears upon its face the indelible stamp of the date and place of its birth, and its form and wording begins to wax old from the day it is born.[1] The dogmas of the Councils and Reformation expressed eternal truths in words and ideas that satisfied their generation. We must translate them into our own words and ideas, if they

[1] This does not refer to the Nicene Creed, every word of which modern thought endorses, but to such dogmas as, *e.g.*, Athanasian Creed and Thirty-nine Articles. See Chap. VIII.

are to retain their true meaning for us. Fourth and sixteenth century dogmas involve ideas as to the universe and its creation, the origin and early history of man, the nature of inspiration, the infallibility of the Bible, and so forth,—ideas borrowed from the philosophy and science of a bygone day. To force them on us to-day is suicidal to Religion and courts a conflict with modern thought which is bound to end in disastrous defeat.

This is why official theology is always at feud with science, and always in distress and panic at each new discovery. Let astronomy tell us the real story of the heavens, or geology that of the earth; let the historian or the spade of the excavator reveal the true past; let Higher Critics show us the Bible in its true light; let ethnologists lay before us the results of their comparative study of religions; let Darwin describe to us the actual course of evolution, —and at once there is an outcry in the theological camp. We are immediately told that the sacred walls of true belief are being undermined, and that the "faith once for all delivered to the saints" is being sapped to its foundations.

The Bible and God's Word.—The identification of these two was the main cause of the angry religious protest against science and its new discoveries. Till recently, the Bible was assumed to be, in the most

narrow and rigid sense of the term, God's own Word, written indeed by human automata, but every syllable of it composed, dictated and, as it were, edited in heaven, and thence miraculously communicated to man.

Divinely inspired the Bible is for us to-day as much as ever. The witness of the Holy Spirit in our own hearts tells us that. But we also know the Bible as the most intensely human of books, all the more helpful because it is the heart-experience of "holy *men* of God." Truth is never so effective as when it becomes incarnate, and their enlightened hearts illumine ours. In God's Light they saw light, even as we. God spake to them exactly as He speaks to us all, but more clearly because their hearts were better attuned to His. He spoke, not from a far-away heaven, but from within their own hearts. His communications were not mechanically imparted from without, but the thoughts of their own hearts suasively influenced by His Spirit. His message comes to us through them superhumanly pure, because their own hearts were so. None the less, it is God's message in and through man. It reaches us coloured, often distorted, by the human mind through which it passes. "We have this treasure in earthern vessels." The Bible contains God's Word, but all of it is not God's Word.

D

It is to our scientific "S. Thomas" age we owe our rude awakening to the limitations of traditional theology and the human element in the Bible, and it is one of the greatest services ever done to Truth and Religion. It has freed us from gross superstition, religious narrowness, and the wholesale throttling of freedom and Truth. But Truth is always bought dear, and we have had to pay the full price for our new and truer knowledge and ideals. This rude scientific shaking of men's faith in a traditional theology, and in a verbally inspired Bible, has played havoc both with the private and public conscience. Old beliefs have been upset and the faith of not a few wrecked. Transition periods are always unsettling and painful. The birth of new ideas dislocating the old, like the surging of new blood through vein and nerve, causes agony. The secret crushing of many hearts, the shattering of old ideals, the falling away of many from the faith, has been the toll levied by this process of transformation and growth, before the Church could attain to larger life and strength.

It has been well worth while. S. Thomas's doubt of old has saved many a soul from doubt, and was a blessing to himself. As his confession of faith

proves, it led to a heart-conviction in Thomas deeper than that of any of the Twelve. So it is with our S. Thomas age. It has left us richer in Religion than it found us, for it has given us a solid body of truths which cannot be shaken, insisted on convictions and not mere opinions, and freed man's conscience and reason. Paradoxical as it sounds, Science has put the coping-stone to the Reformers' work.[1] They stood for the principle of private judgment, but their practice belied their profession, for they only effected a change of masters. They made free use of private judgment themselves,[2] but repudiated more rudely than almost anyone before their day the right of reason (in others) to judge in matters of faith, and demanded its unconditional submission to their own formularies! But they had opened a door never again to be shut, and our age has thrown it wide open.

Science's work was mainly destructive at first, but it has also been largely constructive. It began by taking away much that was imposing in Religion, yet unsubstantial, but it has done not a little to

[1] *i.e.* as the Reformers shook off all human authority so as to establish the authority of God in men's consciences, so God is leading us through science to the Religion of the Spirit. He stirs up His Church and instructs her through science, shows her the ruins of her former shelters, and constrains her to widen her horizon.

[2] *e.g.* Luther calls S. James' Epistle "a veritable epistle of straw, for there is nothing evangelical in it."

rebuild the faith on a bed-rock foundation. To-day there is setting in from scientific circles a strong current of new thought that will eventually lead to the surer recognition of God, and the general re-establishment of belief, on deeper and broader lines than before. Many eminent scientists of the modern school are giving a far more spiritual than material character to Nature, and otherwise providing an intelligible substructure for spiritual truths which previously had nothing but religious intuitions for their support.

True, Science's new ideas have not yet filtered down to the masses, or even to the educated public generally. New ideas, true or false, take a long time to strike root in public opinion, and it is still holding fast to a materialism which is fast dying out, and all but spent, in the eyes of the new generation of scientists. Hence the welter of agnosticism and the flood of rationalistic literature now encompassing us and masquerading as scientific. Where the leaders of scientific thought were thirty years ago, there the great mass of the public is to-day. On the same principle, we may be sure that where the bell-wethers are to-day, there the flock will soon follow.

Be this as it may, we are just emerging out of a critical period of transition which at one time

seemed fraught with danger to Religion. It has left Religion far more secure than it found it. It has brushed away much that was false and given us more that is true. What seemed the hand of the Destroying Angel was really the hand of the Angel of Revelation.

> "I looked, and lo! 'mid the decay,
> The Waster was the Builder too;
> And when the dust-cloud rolled away,
> I saw the new."

E

We have tried to give Science her full due, but have no wish to "beat a jubilant tattoo on the drum scientific," as if she were a second Moses leading us to our Promised Land. Nothing of the kind! As we shall see in the sequel, science is not "a land of Goshen bright neath the splendours of a midday sun, while Religion and Philosophy lie beyond wrapt in impenetrable Egyptian gloom."

Through science God has, no doubt, been teaching us a splendid lesson. He always teaches men one lesson at a time and gives up a generation or two to it in His great time-table. Our fearlessly honest and matter-of-fact 'S. Thomas' age has taught us a much-needed lesson, and done a great and religious work in teaching us the value of

verification and reality. Science has thus cleared and paved the way for greater truths, put up a sign-post here and there, provided a mass of valuable material on which creative thought can presently work, and done good pioneer work. But there her province ends, and she must not fancy that she carries the key to God's Universe in her pocket. We constantly hear people speak as if Science had a monopoly of facts and knew all that is to be said of 'things' and 'mind.' As a matter of fact she never comes into close grip either with things or mind. As Oliver Lodge puts it: "For science to claim a monopoly of knowledge is the presumptuous exercise of the kind of intelligence science uses, a limited intelligence, only possible to a certain very practical and useful sort of brain, which has good solid work of a commonplace kind to do in the world and has been restricted in its outlook, let us say by Providence, so that it may do that one thing and do it well."

This is too strongly worded, but it is true to fact. The scientific intellect may grope into one region of Nature after another, but it is so absorbed and lost among the parts that it has eyes only to see it in sections. It wants the eye of the seer to see it as an organic whole. That is why a Goethe or a Browning gives us a far truer insight into the

inner heart of things than a Huxley or a Kelvin. "Science is a useful and excellent servant in the Temple of Knowledge, but its high-priest! No. She enters not into the Holy Place. Hers is the work of the Levites."

All said and done, science, which seems to explain so much, really gives us a final explanation of nothing whatever. "The aim of science," writes Professor Thomson, "is not to explain, merely to redescribe in simpler terms."

Strange as it may sound in the ears of a science-worshipping age, Science's knowledge is only the common-sense knowledge of the man in the street, carried somewhat further. Ask the man in the street what he means by reality, and he will answer: Why, what a question! A tree is real, all that I can see and touch is real. You ask: And what of my feelings and thoughts, are they real? He shrugs his shoulders and questions that kind of reality. Tell him that the truth of the matter is just the other way round, that thoughts and feelings are the only facts we really know, while no one has ever seen or handled matter, as he understands 'matter,' and he will laugh you to scorn as a visionary or a lunatic.

Science views the world exactly as he does. She takes the material world to be just what it appears

to our senses, the most misleading guides to objective truth. This common-sense knowledge is all she wants for her purely practical purpose, the harnessing of Nature's forces to man's service, and it answers that purpose admirably. 'Matter,' 'force,' 'motion,' — understood in their everyday meaning—form her working assumptions and work out well. That is enough for her. Science never bothers her head as to whether things as they appear to the senses are identical with what they really are in themselves. It does not affect her practical work or its results in the least.

Science stands, so to speak, suspended in the air. With all her profession of building on a bed-rock foundation of verified facts, she starts with "working assumptions" she has not verified. And, even as she starts on a shaky foundation, she leaves us groping in the dark. She gives us conclusions of a sort, but, over and above their purely utilitarian application, she never stops to ask what is their real objective. So long as she harnesses Nature's forces to man's service, she heeds not what lies behind or beyond the 'matter' and 'forces' and 'motion' of the material world as it appears to the senses. Yet it is precisely in these two regions, which Science leaves unexplored, that lie the vital problems of existence and their answer.

Hence we deliberately maintain that the decisive problems of life are not for Science to unravel. They lie beyond her frontiers and her ken. She knows nothing and explains nothing of the origin and purpose of existence. She can and does greatly help us by preparing the ground and supplying most valuable material for the solution of our great problem, but hers is neither the first nor the last word on this vital subject. Hers is not the final court of appeal. She may and must appear as a witness in that court. Her evidence in her special department is invaluable, though she herself fails to see its true and full meaning. But her place is in the witness-box, not on the judgment-seat.[1]

If we are to find the clue to the sphinx-riddle of existence, we must seek it, not in material Nature or through science, but in the human heart. Personality is the gateway through which we must pass to all true knowledge of God, man, Nature, if we are to see them as an organic whole. What the lines we must follow to put us on the right track, we need not discuss here. This is the subject of the following pages.

[1] Cf. B. A. A. "The limitations of Physical Science."

CHAPTER II

THROUGH NATURE TO NATURE'S GOD

(*This chapter is a rapid analysis of the author's* Through Evolution to the Living God, *but it forms an integral part of the main argument and is necessarily included here.*)

A

S. PAUL tells us (Rom. i. 19 sqq.; ii. 12 sqq.; cf. x. 6, 7) that no man can plead ignorance as an excuse for his not knowing God. He has only to look within himself,[1] or at Nature pointing up to Nature's God,[2] to find clear indications of His power, goodness and Godhead.

Paul is right, and modern thought fully endorses his words.[3] Despite the tenacity to their cause of

[1] Cf. Sabatier: "Il y a d'insondables forces au fond de l'âme humaine, parce-qu'au fond il y a Dieu lui-même." "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."

[2] Nature is the expression of God's Thought and Will under finite conditions. Nature's forces are God's exercised Will, Nature's Laws are His expressed Mind, and both Will and Mind fulfil the ends of His loving Heart.

[3] Cf. Romanes: If a little knowledge of physiology and a little knowledge of psychology dispose men to atheism, a deeper know-

a few belated materialists, the undoubted trend of philosophic, and even scientific, thought to-day is towards a spiritual conception of Nature. As to the human heart, Psychology is the latest born of the sciences with us Western races, but we are already all pledged to it. "Consciousness," writes Principal Caird, "is the one key that can unlock the wards of the lock of the Universe."

Man's own heart and Nature—these have been the two natural sources of man's knowledge of God. Some races, *e.g.* the Jews, have travelled to their religious goal mainly by reading the human heart. Others—and all men in the primitive stage—have found God by following the road Nature pointed out to them. In Christianity both these roads meet. Christ's own heart was His main guide, but He listened to what the lilies and sparrows had to tell Him of their God.

Here we shall start with Nature as our first guide, not because she can tell us more about God than our own heart,—she tells us far less,—but because it was certainly at his Mother Nature's knee that man learnt his first lessons of God. For many thousands of years she was man's only schoolmistress God-

ledge of both, and still more, a deeper thought upon their relations one to another, will lead men back to some form of religion, perhaps more vague, but more worthy than that of earlier days." Cf. esp. B. A. A. *passim*.

ward; she is our schoolmistress still.[1] True, our modern standpoint differs radically from primitive man's. He saw Nature through an emotional child's eyes; we read her (overmuch) by the cold dry light of reason, yet we shall see that even cold reason, "taking no private road, looks through Nature up to Nature's God."

Let us, then, begin with the scientific view of Nature. As already said in Chap. I., partial and incomplete as Science's reading of Nature may be, it is of great value so far as it goes. Science, lost among the parts, may not see the meaning of the universe as a whole with the eye of a seer, but it is something to have thrown much light on the parts. It is her important and inalienable province to contribute to philosophy and religion the systematic knowledge of Nature she has acquired, and, without this, any unified and complete interpretation of the universe would be impossible. So if we would attempt to formulate the relation of God to His world, we must take into account the established facts of Natural Science, keep in touch with them, abide by them.

This is briefly the story Science tells us of the

[1] Cf. Linnæus, on seeing the unfolding of a flower, "I saw God in His Glory passing near me, and bowed my head in worship"; and Tennyson: "Little flower,—but if I could understand what you are, root and all, and all in all, I should know what God and man is."

world-evolution: — First we see an intensely hot gaseous cloud, or nebula, vibrating in space, cooled into a Sun rotating on its own axis. This Sun casts off a piece of itself, a portion of its gas-mass, which becomes our own globe and henceforth sails round its parent-Sun. From the Sun we derive all the inorganic elements of our earth. To the Sun we also owe the present conformation of our planet with its land and sea, its internal heat, its climate and atmosphere. All this is deducible from our Sun-birth and might have been predicted at the time it cast us off. As our Earth cools and wrinkles, varied phenomena, due to natural forces, appear on its surface,—sea, dry land, winds, sea-currents, rain-clouds, vegetation, animals, man.

Vegetation, animals, man,—with the appearance of these the comparative simplicity which had hitherto characterised our world-evolution ends, and our first great difficulty begins. To her inorganic matter Nature has now added a new and mysterious factor, organic life.

For the moment, let us keep these two factors apart and first examine the inorganic realm of Nature by itself. Here the most striking feature that meets our eye is the unqualified Reign of Law. Whether we observe stars, crystals, or molecules, everything works smoothly, mechanically, uniformly,

according to unchanging law, as accurately as a perfectly constructed machine. And inorganic Nature *is* a machine, as implicitly to be relied upon as a good clock striking the right hour at the right moment, and by careful observation we can learn the methods and lessons of its mechanism. This we must do, for Nature is a stern step-mother insisting on implicit obedience to her laws and promptly wiping out all who break them. As Huxley puts it: Man plays the game of life with an invisible power, Nature. "The player on the other side is hidden from us. We know his play is always fair, just, patient. But we also know to our cost that he never overlooks a mistake or makes the slightest allowance for ignorance. To the man who plays well, the highest stakes are paid with that sort of overflowing generosity with which the strong delight in strength. And who plays ill is checkmated, without haste, but without remorse. Nature's discipline is not even a word and a blow; but the blow without the word. It is left to you to find out why your ears are boxed." Learn my laws and obey them, says Nature to us, and I will be your friend and servant, for I can supply you with all the means you want to attain almost any end you may desire; break my laws and I will break you.

So, for our own well-being and very existence,

the problem for each one of us is to find out the rules of Nature's game: "O teach me Thy statutes." They are not hard to learn. So uniformly and simply does she work that we can readily discover the laws of Nature, the orderly and unchanging methods according to which her forces actually work. Everything obeys what we call the law of cause and effect, *i.e.* similar antecedents are invariably accompanied by similar consequents. Even in her earthquakes and storms, rain and drought, capricious as these phenomena may seem, Nature obeys law. The same results always occur under the same conditions. This "constancy of results" proves that everything in the inorganic universe is regulated by forces that work with absolute uniformity. Indeed, if we could imagine a perfectly wise man present at the birth of the world, he could there and then have foreseen its *material* history to all ages. From what lay before him, say in the primeval nebula, and from his absolute knowledge of the natural forces at work upon this primal molecular matter, he could have foretold the material world as we see it in 1914 A.D.[1]

[1] This purely scientific view is not true to facts, strictly speaking. His calculations would be upset through ignoring the immense power wielded by 'will' or 'mind' over matter, as we shall see later. Life introduces an incalculable element, inexplicable by the mere laws of chemistry and physics, and man's action is far from a negligible quantity.

The key-note of inorganic Nature, then, is the unqualified security of its Reign of Law. Science glories in the revelation of regularity and certainty, harmony and proportion, which Geology and Cosmic Physics proclaim. For her, the world is an organic whole where everything is in its place, everything has its season and function, everything moves according to settled rhythm and law. The pet scientific phrase, "Uniformity of Nature," means this and nothing else. It means that the Universe is an organic whole, a rational unity, a realm of law, a physical cosmos so trustworthy and veracious that its perfect behaviour in the past may be taken as a warrant for its equally perfect physical behaviour in the future. This is the bed-rock foundation of science, and, without absolute confidence in its trustworthiness, there could be no scientific knowledge of Nature at all.

From the uniformity of Nature Science draws an important corollary, and it is this: If Force be the motive-power in or behind the Universe, there must be one force and no more. All the various 'forces' of Nature we know, are only different manifestations and transformations of the One Force or underlying Energy that moves the whole. Otherwise we should have, not a Universe, but a multiverse, a chaos and not a cosmos, anarchy and not law, whereas scientific

observation proves it to be one rational organic whole. We shall come back to this admission later, for it is deeply significant.

B

Let us now turn from the inorganic to the organic realm of Nature, the realm of life as seen in vegetation, animals and man.

Some considerable time — probably a hundred million years or more—after the earth had provided itself with a solid crust, a wondrous event happened. Organic life appeared in the form of plant-life, succeeded later on by animal life. We see little jelly-dots grow into plants, and, later, somewhat similar jelly-dots grow into animals. For a long period, the sea was the common home of both. To speak only of animal-organisms, in the course of their evolution some of these sea-animals became amphibious, almost equally at home in water or on land. Of these *amphibia*, some eventually branched off into birds, others into reptiles, and from the same source were evolved quadrupeds, and finally man. But, one and all, they are the outcome of the little original jelly-dots.

This rough-and-ready sketch of life-evolution may suffice to show that we are here face to face with a

terrific problem. We see jelly-dots — specks of matter quickened by a mysterious something that (*pace* Haeckel) is not matter—evolve into fishes, birds, reptiles, four-footed beasts, man. Endless variations from type, constant new departures meet us at every turn of this life-evolution. We seem to jump from the law and order of the inorganic realm to a realm of caprice and anarchy baffling all explanation.

How did this life-germ get here? It could hardly accompany the gas-mass, now our globe, when it was cast off from the sun. No form of life could live in an atmosphere of such intense temperature. Haeckel's hypothesis of spontaneous generation from inorganic matter would solve the difficulty, but the best modern scientists refuse to endorse it, because no one hitherto has given a satisfactory explanation of the process, far less succeeded in experimental proofs of spontaneous generation;[1] though this in no way disproves Haeckel's theory.

[1] As Sir O. Lodge, Professors Armstrong and L. Hill emphasised at the British Association, 1913, even if chemists manufactured a lump of protoplasm in the laboratory, and supposing we could so arrange it so that life sprang into being, we should not in the least degree have made life. "The living principle or energy, pertaining to this living matter, would not have sprung from it, but would have come from outside" (Hill). "Such a laboratory experiment, if successful, would not be the discovery of the origin of life, but the construction of a physical and chemical vehicle that could be made use of by life" (O. Lodge).

Personally, we should welcome a discovery bridging the at present impassable gulf between inorganic matter and organic life, thus evolving *all* from *one* primordial substance potentially permeated by an informing and quickening spirit. From a religious point of view, the more simply the whole thing is done, the more divine does it become in our eyes. The ordinary view which credits God with two, three, or even four successive creations,—matter, plants, animals, man,—is a hindrance and not a help. Man and animals are now known to be of one stock, while the line of demarcation between plants and animals—Protophyta and Protozoa—is so impossible to draw that eminent scientists refuse to draw it. It would be the ideal of a Divine Evolution, if science could help us one step further and show us matter endowed with such intrinsic powers that we should see "spirit" sleeping in matter, awakening in plants, awake in animals, self-conscious in man. We would then say, not only with Owen, "man was present as an ideal upon earth from the beginning of organisms," but, "man was present from the beginning of matter."

If we are ever to get at the true explanation of the world and all it contains, it will doubtless be an explanation in which the ideal in all its completeness governs the whole process, where, from start to

finish, there is no breach of continuity. The objection to Haeckel's hypothesis, as he states it, lies far deeper than man's inability to explain or prove it. The rock on which his theory must split is this, he makes $3 \times 1 = 20$; he puts much more into the 'effect' than was contained in the 'cause.' If you insist on seeing in matter the cause of mind, it must be because matter is not merely matter, but already contains virtually all that mind is. There are two ways of explaining an evolution which seems to start from nebular molecules and finds its apex in self-conscious man. We can either explain the end by the beginning and say: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," or reverse the process and say: "Spirit thou art, and hast always been." On the principle that no thing comes out of nothing and no stream can rise above its source, you must take care, whichever view you adopt, that you do not put into the 'effect,' or consequent, anything that was not already implicitly contained in the 'cause' or antecedent. In man, self-consciousness or mind is here on earth; and if thought is "but the expression of molecular changes in the brain-cells or physical matter of life," merely "a chemical product in the same sense as are sugar and vitriol," then you are right in saying "dust thou art." If we resent this identification of thought with matter,

and place matter at the bottom of the scale and thought at its apex, then we must explain the lower factor in terms of the higher, and not the higher by the lower, and say "Spirit thou art and hast always been." As Watson says in his *Outlines of Philosophy*: "Existence, as a whole, contained within itself, prior to its manifestation as consciousness, all that so manifested itself. What is posterior in time is prior in nature; the first is last and the last first."

To show that this is not the mere make-believe of idealist visionaries, let us quote a witness more acceptable to the other side. "I understand," writes Huxley, "the main tenet of Materialism to be that there is nothing in the universe but matter or force, and that all the phenomena of Nature are explicable by deduction from properties assignable to these two primitive factors. But all this I heartily disbelieve. It seems to me pretty plain that there is a third thing present in the Universe, to wit, consciousness, which I cannot see to be matter or force, or any conceivable modification of either, and that our certain knowledge does not extend beyond our states of consciousness. All the materialist writers I know who have tried to bite that file have simply broken their teeth." Again: "How it is that anything so remarkable as a state of consciousness comes about as the result of irritating

nervous tissue, is just as unaccountable as the appearance of the Djin when Aladdin rubbed his lamp in the story." Tyndall says just the same thing: "The passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable."[1]

As a matter of fact, we shall see later that the gulf between matter and mind is not so unbridgeable as it seems, and that matter is only explicable in terms of mind. We must spiritualise matter, not materialise mind.

Over and above the initial problem of the origin of life, there is another difficult question in connection with the evolution of organic life, viz. given the life-germ in a jelly-dot, how does this jelly-dot of protoplasm evolve into a man? Scientists *seem* to offer us a simple explanation apparently accounting for this production of such a big result out of a next-to-nothing speck of animated matter. They profess to account for every single new factor at each stage

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: 'The superphysical element in Life;' *e.g.* "To explain the psychical in terms of physics is simply impossible;" and "There is plenty of physics and chemistry and mechanics about every vital action, but for a complete understanding of it something beyond physics and chemistry is needed;" and "Science sees nothing but matter and its laws in organisms. Naturally enough. This is all that appears to the senses and all that scientists can take cognizance of in their laboratory; but life and mind and consciousness science cannot ignore, though it only sees and knows their physical and chemical manifestations," etc. etc.

by what the organism picks up by the way, and see in this organic evolution nothing that does not fall under the ordinary natural law of cause and effect.

To take a simple illustration. A seed in the ground grows into a flower or tree. How is it done? In the heart of the seed dwells a life-germ whose essential nature it is to develop along certain lines and no others. It makes the seed perform in its own person certain elaborate chemical operations. For instance, it converts into food and assimilates the materials supplied by the soil, air, water in its neighbourhood, manufactures these elements into the components of which its body consists, and so grows in bulk, matures, becomes a flower or a tree. The seed never could become anything but a seed, were it not for the introduction and assimilation of these new elements into its own life.

So it is, scientists tell us, with the transmutation of a lower organism, *e.g.* a fish, into a new and higher organism. The change of type can only take place through the introduction of some new elements and forces into the life-experience of the species. As soon as these new factors come in, a change in physical structure is bound to follow in response to new environment. For example, sea-animals have no wish to seek the land; but occasionally they have

to live in shallow places near shore, uncovered by the low tide for some hours, and they have to learn to be amphibious or die. If food is scarce in their water and plentiful on land near the shore, these amphibia follow it and take more and more to land-life and become reptiles. Some even learn to rise out of the water or land into the air in quest of their prey or to avoid their foes, gradually evolve wings and become birds. Others, again, develop into four-footed beasts of the field. One set of these quadrupeds adopted a semi-erect posture and eventually evolved into man. And each adaptation to new environment involved a corresponding change of physical structure.

C

Now, simple and satisfactory as this scientific explanation may seem, it really explains nothing at all. It is a good description of what actually took place; otherwise it leaves us exactly where we were. We could have no better illustration of Professor Thomson's words: "The aim of science is, not to explain, but to redescribe in simpler terms." The imposing terms "new environment" and "Natural Selection" only give us the least important part of the clue to life-evolution, its 'occasion,' not its cause.

It is all very well to tell us: Life-evolution is very

simple. Nothing new is really created, merely a transformation of elements already in existence, and picked up by the way, into something different through a new chemical combination of these elements. This sort of explanation does well enough when we are dealing with inorganic matter, *e.g.*, the formation of a crystal of quartz, but such a mechanical explanation utterly breaks down when applied to organic life, *e.g.*, the evolution of brain, eye, or any physical organ.

Even the roughest sketch of what we mean by inert matter and organic life will make this plain. In inert matter, *e.g.*, a crystal or a liquid, we have a mere aggregate of molecules lying outside and independent of each other, and artificially held or fused together by a force acting upon them from without. You can break up this aggregate into its component parts and recombine them at will just as before. The unity of such "parcels of inert matter" is a purely artificial and manufactured unity made up of the sum-total of its component parts, any one of which in and by itself has as much right to be called a unity as the whole mass. Any chemist who knows its formula can produce it at will in his laboratory. Of such aggregates, it is perfectly correct to say that they have grown out of "new elements picked up by the way." Thus if

a crystal of alum be put into a concentrated hot solution of alum, the molecules are attracted to and formed on the crystal so that it increases in size. More than this, if a crystal of quartz be examined, the angles between the facets are always constant, even though the facets be of unequal size. And of all inorganic matter we can say: (1) It is an artificial unity, a mere aggregate of molecules held together by force from without; (2) "Constancy of results" is the invariable rule.—It is therefore easy to apply to inert matter the ordinary mechanical law of physical cause and effect. It holds good there in all cases.

Now turn to plants and animals and see in what a totally different way they behave from anything we know in the world of inert matter; in a way so strange and apparently capricious that no chemist or biologist, however great his knowledge of them and their antecedents, can tell beforehand what they will do next. If "constancy of results" is the note of inert matter, "infinite variability" is the note of organisms. They are sensitive to all change in their surroundings and have a wondrous knack of adapting themselves to it. "In plants and animals," writes Prof. Henslow, "the moment a change of environment occurs, at that moment they begin to adapt themselves by response to their surroundings, to

build up new cells and tissues quite different from those made up to that moment. Thus if a water-plant be growing up submerged, but reaches the surface of the water and then grows into the air, *the whole anatomy at once changes at the water-level.* Similarly in animals, the wool of a sheep of temperate regions becomes silky in hot ones. The paddle-like limbs, adapted for swimming, of animals that live in water, are due to the same cause. This power of changing the form according to requirement has no parallel either in the inorganic world or in the manufactories of man." [1]

Why do inert parcels of matter and animated parcels of matter (*i.e.* organisms) behave so differently? Simply because an organism is a parcel of matter *plus* something more. It is a parcel of matter held together, but by a force acting *from within* the organism itself, and in such a way that the parts are no longer artificially kept together, but indissolubly related to the whole and to each other as closely and vitally as the body and its

[1] Of course, there is "constancy of results" in the organic as well as the inorganic world, *e.g.*, a tree puts on its leaves in spring as soon as the temperature rises to a degree peculiar to its wants. Such uniformity of sequence is common in organic life. But what is peculiar to and the note of organic life is the power of prompt adaptation in response to the direct action of changed conditions of life.

members. Let one suffer and all suffer together sympathetically. Try to break up an organism into its component parts and recombine them, as we did just now with aggregates of inert matter, and you instantly squeeze its very essence out of it and cannot coax it back.

Thus an organism is a parcel of matter indissolubly held together and quickened by a dynamic force or life-principle within, making it one compact living whole and prompting it to perform in its own person certain elaborate chemical operations at its bid and call. In a word, this dynamic force or principle [1] within makes the organism act as if it were a self-creating and self-growing machine reproducing, enriching, transfiguring itself, and repairing its own worn-out parts, all at the bidding of some monitor within its own heart, who seems equal to every emergency that may arise.

[1] We must take care not to confound this vital principle, or self-directing consciousness within, with any of the forces it directs. We have popularly used the term dynamic force, but force is blind and directs nothing. It wants to be guided. Thus a batsman wants to send his ball where no fieldsman is to stop it. He uses force residing in his muscles to propel the ball, but the muscle-force wants directing and his *mind* prompts the direction. Yet the mind itself is not a force in the sense that it takes any part in the propulsion of the ball. So of the consciousness in plants and animals, it tells or directs the organism what to do, but it does nothing itself beyond giving directions. (See esp. Croll, *Basis of Evolution.*)

It is the presence of this "mysterious psychic something" within plants and animals which upsets all our *a priori* calculations. In inorganic matter there is uniformity of sequence, 'constancy of results.' In organic life, the controlling force within the secret heart of the organism determines its development in a way that no one can safely predict before the event. And this dynamic force is always there as the dominant cause of all change in the organism. In inert matter, the cause passes away in its effects and ceases to be in its original form, reappearing in another form. Thus when a bullet strikes a target, its molecular motion passes into heat and ceases to exist as motion; and so it is when heat passes into electricity, and electricity into magnetism. But it is not so with organisms. A jelly-dot of protoplasm evolves into a fish, reptile, quadruped, a man. Here we have a cause—the life-principle present in the nucleus of protoplasm—which does not pass away in its effects, but lives on and maintains itself in them; while they in their turn, the more they receive from the cause which is their soul and source, the more they give back of their substance and enrich it. Far from losing what it gives to its organic members, the soul of the organism receives it back with heavy interest. It would be marred, or even cease to be, if its giving

away of the best in itself were interrupted or arrested.

Now, surely, we can see why we cannot possibly apply to organisms the ordinary physical law of cause and effect, and why the so-called scientific explanation of life-evolution is no explanation at all. Though it looks exactly like a parcel of matter, an organism is an *animated* parcel of matter, and this makes all the difference in the world. Through its dynamic life-principle within its heart, it is *self*-caused and *self*-developing. It is not the creature of outside environment; it bends that environment to do its will by self-adaptation in response to it.[1]

To say "new surroundings and Natural Selection account for all organic evolution" is a mere superficial half-truth bordering on non-sense. 'Natural Selection' is an unfortunate and most misleading word, and sounds as if Nature did this or that by a deliberate act of choice. Natural Selection does nothing, produces nothing. Its effect is purely negative. All it means is that in the struggle for existence the weak go to the wall and do *not* survive. As for 'new surroundings,' their effect

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "As regards performance of work, a living thing obeys the laws of physics, like all else; but undoubtedly *it initiates processes and produces results that without it could not have occurred.*"

would also be nil if they were not brought to bear on organisms with a 'soul' in them.[1] 'New surroundings' and 'Natural Selection' can be called the 'occasion' or 'condition' of organic evolution, but certainly not its cause. All plant and animal variations are due to *inherent* energy in the organisms themselves.[2] Thence, and nowhere else, comes the suggestion and determination not to succumb to environment, but to rise above it by self-adaptation and turn it into a useful servant. Ch. Darwin suspected something of the kind. He writes to Huxley: "You have cleverly hit upon one point which has greatly troubled me; if, as I think, external conditions produce little *direct* effect, what the devil determines each particular variation?"

Call this dynamic principle within organisms their 'soul,' 'life,' 'personality,' 'consciousness,' 'mind,' or what you will, it is there as *the* self-directing, creative, dynamic energy guiding them and determining their form and growth. *They make themselves*, and are not made by something outside themselves. To apply the ordinary physical

[1] F. Darwin, Dublin Association, 1908: "In all living things there is something psychic. Even in plants there exists a faint copy of what we know as consciousness in ourselves."

[2] Cf. Oliver Lodge: "The animal organism is the organ of a creative soul within it as its controlling and guiding principle, responsible for the personal expression and the construction of the organic body."

laws of cause and effect mechanically to them is to put the cart before the horse, or to make the tail wag the dog. Life-evolution, without the struggle for existence and new surroundings, could never have been what it is, but environment and Natural Selection occupy a very secondary place in the process, and the organism's initiative is out and away the prime factor.

So clearly has the presence and all-importance of this mysterious psychic energy, this creative self-directing consciousness within organisms, been realised that Prof. Church has coined the word 'Directivity' for it.[1] It is to this self-directivity of the soul that we owe our eyes, ears, hands, feet, nerves, brain, our physical everything. It simply called all our organs into being in response to *stimuli* or promptings from the Reality outside itself, *i.e.*, Nature, which it wanted to interpret. The soul's Directivity made its organism fling out feeler after feeler into the dusk, strain after something of which it was only dimly conscious, make faith-ventures for its own better efficiency and self-realisation. These outside *stimuli* were factors in the development of our bodily organs, their occasion, but not their determining cause as Ch.

[1] Croll's word 'Determinism' is not so good, because of its other associations.

Darwin at first imagined. Each of these creations is the outcome of the *élan* of the soul, the instinctive result of the soul's creative genius to express and realise itself. In organisms, Nature ceases to be the machine she is in the realm of inert matter and becomes a living, inspired, creative Artist.

Here, at last, in soul-directivity we have the foundation-stone of life-evolution, its true key.[1] The whole history of organic evolution is but the history of a self-directing creative consciousness seeking and finding its more and more adequate self-expression by mastering and moulding environment and matter to do its bidding. From protoplasm to man, we see its creative work in its ever-upward march along a line of unbroken continuity. Acting as a *vis a tergo*, or rather as a dynamic energy from within outwards, organic Directivity impels its organism onward and upward, yet never asks it to do more than it can do, one short step at a time. It is a long series of little-by-little movements of adjustment to new circumstances as they arise. So does every stage in organic evolution dovetail into what goes before and after it. Nothing

[1] Cf. Prof. Armstrong, British Association, 1913: "We now know, in the most absolute way, that all vital actions are directed actions, the processes taking place much in the same way that a dressmaker builds up a dress."—In Chap. VI. we shall find in 'Soul-directivity' the clue to freedom of will.

valuable in the old is given up, while, in the new, what was hitherto a latent possibility becomes actuality. For instance, man comes from and has outdistanced the beasts of the field, but his higher nature retains the quintessence of all the physical and psychical qualities to be found in lower organisms. And at every step forward in this gradually progressive ascent, we clearly trace the progressive mastery of the material by the spiritual. Mind becomes more and more the dominant partner as we go up the ladder of organic life; matter takes a more and more subordinate place.

D

What interpretation are we to put upon these facts of a creative evolution and the Directivity behind it? Only two explanations are possible. With Haeckel, we may believe that man has evolved from animals, animals from vegetation, vegetation from protoplasm, protoplasm by decomposition of inorganic matter; and that all this is done by blind forces bereft of intelligence or purpose. It is all, as he puts it, the outcome of the "redistribution of matter in motion under the influence of blind Force." Or else we may see in Evolution and the Directivity of organic life the indication of an

immanent mind. The latter alternative covers the facts far more truly than the other, and for the following reasons.

Even materialism admits that an evolution which begins with matter finds its apex in self-conscious man. It also admits that Nature is uniform, *i.e.* a rational organic whole. Now if evolution culminates in mind; and if there is, moreover, unity, system, continuity in the process, this can hardly be the outcome of blind Force working on matter.[1] You cannot possibly put into the effects elements that were not already implicitly contained in the producing cause. This is not an *ex parte* plea just to suit our case. Lord Kelvin openly states: "We are absolutely forced by science to believe with perfect confidence in a directive Power. There is nothing between absolute scientific belief in a creative Power and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms." You may hold this view and still look upon matter as a real entity,

[1] As so often said already, science knows nothing but what appears to the senses. Matter and force appeal strongly to our senses, not so mind and directivity and purpose, therefore science ignores these latter. But in attributing all to Force, they forget what Croll has so well shown, that Force can direct nothing, but has itself to be directed. "The behaviour of a ship firing shot and shell is explicable in terms of force, but the discrimination or directing mind which enables it to distinguish between friend and foe is not so explicable." Why insist on one because it is within your ken, and ignore the other because it is not?

containing in itself the "promise and the potency of all terrestrial life." But if you hold this view of matter, you must spiritualise it, endow it from the outset with the germ of mind, make it contain within itself all that mind is. Otherwise, you will never get mind out of it, nor a rational and intelligible universe, and they are both here.

"No account of the universe," says Prof. Dewey, "in terms *merely* of the redistribution of matter is complete, no matter how true so far as it goes, for it ignores the cardinal fact that the character of this matter in motion and its redistribution is such as cumulatively to achieve ends,—to have effected the world of values we know. Deny this, and you deny evolution; admit it, and you admit purpose, *i.e.* an intelligent Mind."

To sum up. A universe described in evolutionary terms is a universe characterised by (1) unity of plan, (2) tendency, (3) purpose. *Unity of plan.* Science is entirely based on the Uniformity of Nature, *i.e.* it views Nature as a rational organic whole. Now what is this but the admission that, beneath the manifold variety of world-phenomena, there is a single master-principle at work, a rational and veracious principle pervading, quickening, unifying the whole, making it all of one piece. *Tendency.* Evolution is nothing if not a con-

tinuous[1] onward and upward march from next-to-nothing beginnings to the world of values we know as its provisional goal. Its line may be zig-zag and show traces of degeneration as well as evolution, but the character of the cosmic mechanism is such as to produce and sustain good in a multiplicity of forms and to wipe out what is bad. To ignore this is to refuse to open our eyes to the total aspect of existence, which is certainly good on the whole. *Purpose.* No one who traces the gradual evolution of man's self-conscious mind from its rudimentary beginnings, watching one stage dovetail into another, surely but almost imperceptibly, by a gradual series of little-by-little movements of self-adaptation to new environment under the guidance of Directivity, can doubt Owen's words: "Man, from the beginning of organisms, was present as an ideal upon earth."

The last statement may be pooh-poohed as the exploded argument from design. Science no longer objects to the argument from design, when teleology deals with the world as a whole and not the mere adaptation of one tiny part to another part. The evidences of evolutionary design are so manifest in

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Continuity is undoubtedly the backbone of evolution, as taught by all biologists—no artificial demarcations or boundaries between species—a continuous chain of heredity from far below the amœba up to man."

Nature that scientists are becoming more and more teleological.[1] As one of their number writes: "To speak of *evolution* as a sufficient explanation of plant and animal development is like speaking of the principle of *revolution* as a sufficient explanation of calico-weaving in a cotton-factory. As soon as we attempt to explain why the calico-machine's wheels go round, we are invariably led up to think of its designer and the purpose for which it was designed. Yet what is a spinning-machine compared with the infinitely grander mechanism of Nature?" Similarly Darwin owns that to him the strongest argument for the existence of an intelligent mind, in or behind the universe, is his inability to believe that the universe owes its existence to blind chance.[2]

Surely, this unity of plan, this sense of values, this onward and upward tendency to ever higher

[1] Cf. Aubrey Moore: "The evolution which was at first supposed to have destroyed teleology is found to be more saturated with teleology than the view which it superseded." Cf. especially British Assoc. Address, 1913, "The Evidence of Design," a masterly section.

[2] "The impossibility of conceiving that this great and wondrous universe arose through chance seems to me to be the chief argument for the existence of God" (Ch. Darwin, 1873). Cf. Dr. Baker, President of Math. and Physical-Science Section, British Association, 1913: "He must have studied Nature in vain who does not see that our spiritual activities are inherent in the mighty process of which we are part, etc."

ends, one and all contradict Haeckel's explanation of evolution as "a redistribution of matter in motion under the influence of blind force." When we see stones carefully cut into shape and put into place and emerging into a cathedral, we do not speak of the process as a redistribution of matter in motion under the influence of blind Force; we look upon the cathedral as the expression of an artist's idea. Prof. Dewey is right. Admit evolution, and you must admit Intelligence, Will, and Purpose in and behind this evolution as its driving-power and its key. The universe is one scheme, and Mind is the meaning of it.

CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

A

OUR main argument in the last chapter was this: In Nature we have a realm of inert matter, *plus* a realm of organic life. The key-note of inorganic Nature is the unqualified security of its reign of law, or the Uniformity of Nature. Were Nature not thus uniform, steadfast, reliable, rational, an organic whole; if its courses were subject to incalculable capricious breaks and departures, we should live in a perpetual state of insecurity; not only scientific knowledge, but civilisation itself would be impossible.

Turning from the inorganic to the organic realm, we saw Nature, no longer a clock-work machine, but a creative Artist with a definite master-idea to realise. And she sets to work patiently, skilfully, methodically to realise it. In military phrase, it is not a series of dashing but desultory raids; it is the

steady disciplined advance of a regularly mobilised army under a general who has carefully thought and mapped out the whole plan of campaign. In other words, we see an immense number of living organisms marching forward steadily towards a definite goal or ideal,—self-conscious man. Yet not a single one of these individual organisms is at the time aware that it is making for that goal or straining after this ideal. Neither the idea of its own future, nor the *élan* which at each successive stage it puts forth in order to reach its ideal, is consciously present to it. Each of these organisms simply and unconsciously, yet implicitly, obeys the law of its being written in its own heart, and makes for the goal to which its soul-directivity points. And all the while each organism is not only following the law of its own true development, but also at the same time materially contributing to the evolution of other organisms and the realisation of one common ideal. To revert to our military metaphor, the general from the outset has the whole plan of campaign clearly before his mind's eye, while the officers, companies, and units under him are simply following his directions implicitly as given in their marching-orders, unaware of their final destination and asking no questions; yet they get there.

This exactly represents Nature's organic evolu-

tion from 'a blob of protoplasmic jelly' up to man, as science reads it. All along in this life-evolution, Nature has been giving clearer and clearer expression to an inner-principle, a master-idea, and making for a definite goal: "man, from the beginning of organisms, was present as an ideal upon earth." Even in the amœba, man was there potentially. There was already present within the heart of this rudimentary organism a creative self-directing consciousness[1] straining, all unconsciously but with a true and unerring instinct, after this ideal. As thoroughgoing evolutionists, because we believe Science's transcript of Nature to be true and life-evolution to be an 'evolution' in the real sense of the word, we are not afraid to attribute purpose to Nature. Nature meant all along to realise in her ideal a result of immense value, to produce a self-conscious being aware of herself and her processes, aware of himself and his own freedom, and thus fit to be a fellow-worker with her towards the achievement of a still higher ideal,—and she has done it.

With the advent of man upon earth began a new departure in evolution which was nothing short of a revolution, and for this reason. A plant or animal

[1] Cf. Bergson: "Even the amœba displays the rudiments of 'choice.'" Cf. J. A. Thomson: "Even in the amœba, organic growth is a creative, selective, self-expressive process."

strives after an ideal, with a true instinct but all unconsciously; it neither knows nor wills its own evolution; it merely obeys instinctively the law of its being written in its heart. Self-conscious man, on the other hand, both knows and wills the realisation of his ideals; the General-in-chief has let him into part of the secrets of the campaign and is more and more taking him into His counsels, so that man now works intelligently with Him to the achievement of its successful issue.

On these and other grounds, we saw in evolution a final reply to materialism and conclusive evidence of an idealism. We concluded that a universe described in evolutionary terms, as Science herself puts it before us, reveals Nature as a creative Artist. In religious phrase, in Nature dwells a Mind and a Will working with a definite aim.

B

Let us see how far Nature has taken us on our road to God. Our study of the evolution of the universe, as read in the light of modern science, shows us Mind + Will + Purpose present in or behind Nature. If we call this omnipresent creative directing Consciousness God, then He is an Immanent or indwelling God, whatever else He

may be. "In Him we (and all things) live, move, and have our being." Just as we have seen that our body and all its organs and faculties are the creation of a directive creative soul within, the outcome of its quest for self-realisation or self-expression, so we may call the Universe God's Body. His Consciousness pervades, quickens, unifies it all, even as the human consciousness pervades and quickens our bodily members and the very hairs of our head. Because of this indwelling of God in His universe, even the material world is far more spiritual than material, while, as Herbert Spencer suspected, "the Consciousness of the Unknowable Power behind the universe wells up in all organic life, and most of all in man." In every blade of grass God is there, and His Spirit is the soul of man.

Nature thus becomes spiritualised, glorified, transfigured. We can no longer say: In the material world I see no God, only the brute forces of Nature acting by mindless law. We have now to say: In Nature I see the manifestation and self-expression of the thought and will of God Himself.[1]

And if the indwelling God, Whom Science pro-

[1] In this light, S. Paul's picture of the material world sharing man's sorrow and the fruits of his evil—"the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now"—assumes a new and deep meaning. Paul's mysticism ever gave him true intuitions.

claims, glorifies Nature, His Immanence enhances a hundredfold the dignity of man, spirit of His Spirit, His child. "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are," is now a scientific fact. The mind and heart and will at work in us, the thoughts of holiness that arise in us, the aspirations we cherish, the love we feel, the law written in our hearts, our whole soul-directivity, all that makes the spirit and inspiration of man is but the revelation and self-expression of the God in us. He *is* the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world; in the truest sense of the word, He is our Father, and we are partial incarnations of Him.

So actually one in essence does this Nature-Gospel reveal God and man to be, that no *essential* change is needed either in God or man to make them perfectly at one. Of course, this is not the grotesque assertion 'man is God,' but man is in a line with God, even as man is in a line with the ape or the amœba. Much development of latent potentialities, but no essential change, was needed to convert the man in the amœba into actual man, and, even so, much development is needed, but no essential change, to convert the potential divinity within ourselves into its actuality. "We do not yet know what we shall be, but we know that we shall be like Him."

This reveals the Incarnation in a new light. The perfect Man Jesus is the practical demonstration that the full tide of divine life can flow into the channels of purely human nature. "In Him dwelt the fulness of God bodily." He is the Word made flesh, we are only words made flesh, faint copies and partial incarnations of God. "I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." In Him we see the perfect Son, the heavenly Man, our perfect Archetype, the ideal after which we are straining afar off.

The Immanence of God also throws a new light on the Creation and the Fall. If the universe is the self-expression of an indwelling God's thought and will under conditions of finite time and space, if it is the Body of which He is the soul, then surely there never was a time when God did not express Himself in thought and will. Creation is eternal, without beginning or ending, actively going on now as fully as ever. "My Father worketh hitherto." And if the modern doctrine of evolution, as the self-expression of an indwelling purposive Mind, exalts our conception of Creation, it also radically transfigures the popular conception of the Fall. A divine evolution, steadily marching onward and upward to the one great purpose to which all creation moves, never has had such a fatal set-back as the Fall implies. Our so-called Fall was a

necessary moment in the transition from the stage of animal natural innocence to the far higher stage of the birth of a moral sense. It represents the dawn of moral consciousness in man, the real birthday of man.

All this sounds perilously near to Pantheism; we own it. Natural Religion is ever liable to this danger. "God is the indwelling Word, Reason, World-soul that makes, unifies, quickens the whole Universe" may sound imposing, but it makes God, apparently, only a fine name for the Universe and identifies Him with it, giving us a thin vague abstraction instead of a Personal God. "Such a filmy idea touches the heart, or meets the needs of man, as little as does the undulatory theory of light or the music of the spheres."

This may be true of us ordinary, matter-of-fact, prosaic men, but it is not true of a Browning, Tennyson, Goethe, Psalmist, Christ, or of any seer who has eyes to see into the heart of things. When Linnæus or Tennyson or Christ saw God's Glory in a lily and bowed their heads in worship, or when Mrs. Browning saw 'earth crammed with God,' they did not identify God with His Universe. For them Nature was a living witness to God, a revelation of Him, His Body and outer garment. Through Nature they caught a glimpse of an Immanent yet

Transcendent God who spoke to their very heart and soul.[1]

Besides, we must not forget that suns, stars, mountains, streams, trees, flowers, animals do not cover all we mean by God's Universe. That the All is a manifestation, a revelation of God, and, in a manner, God Himself, is true. But what does the All include? It were a strange kind of Universe that included stars, trees, lilies, animals and so forth and left out self-conscious men. Someone has well said, "As things now are, you must dichotomise the universe, putting man as covering one-half, and all things else the other." Shall we only identify God, or the All, with the one-half of His Universe, and exclude from the All the heart and mind and will, the personality and highest attributes of which we ourselves are immediately conscious?

So if Natural Religion borders on Pantheism, let us be fair and define clearly the creed it puts in our heart. Nature clearly tells us that there is a Mind and a Will in or behind the Universe guiding its evolution. It sees in this creative directive Consciousness, or God, the Soul and Life

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "We are deaf and blind to the immanent grandeur around us, unless we have insight enough to recognise in the woven fabric of existence, flowing steadily from the loom in an infinite progress towards perfection, the ever-growing garment of a transcendent God."

and Light of all that is. But it also tells us that we ourselves are in the image of God, spirit of His Spirit. Our reason and conscience are from Him and of Him, faint copies or reproductions of Himself and His own attributes.

Thus our Nature-Gospel puts us on the track which, as we shall see later on, will eventually lead us to the Personal God our heart yearns for. In man's personality, Nature puts into our hands the real clue to the God we seek. If the material universe only lands us in a semi-Pantheism, the organic universe opens the door of escape from Pantheism, and shows us how we can come to the loving Personal Father Who meets our every want, if we will but look within ourselves. In man's reason and heart and will, God and man meet. If we may say so here, the Heart and Consciousness of the Man Jesus Christ is the link that at-ones us with God, and completes the natural chain that leads right up from the things that are seen in Nature to Nature's God. But this anticipates our future chapters.

C

Nature thus shows us a God endowed with a Mind and Will, can she tell us anything of God's loving heart? The mystery of evil and pain seems

to many a thinker to bar the way in this direction. They say, and apparently with much reason: "The cosmic process has no sort of relation to moral ends. It is just as true to assert that Natural Selection, in the struggle for existence, has evolved the immoral as the moral sentiments. It certainly achieves progress through misery and death, and is terribly cruel, wasteful, almost cynical."

Is this statement quite fair? Is the cosmic process heartless and immoral? Does Nature throw no light on the loving Heart of God? Not for one moment do we pretend that Natural Religion, in the narrower sense,[1] gives us anything like as good a clue to the solution of this mystery as does man's heart,—and especially The Man's Heart. But it does give us a clue, and along the same lines.

If we believe, as evolution compels us to believe, that the universe is one organic whole and God the soul and meaning of it,—for it is His Body,—then our evil, physical and moral, affects Him as well as ourselves. It is of the very essence of an organic whole that, if one member of it suffers, every other member, and the whole, suffers in sympathy with it. Now we, and all organisms,

[1] We have seen above that man is part of the universe, therefore man's spiritual intuitions as revealed in the Bible really come under Natural Religion.

are part and parcel, subordinate yet intrinsic parts, of God our Whole. He is our Soul and all-embracing Whole. Not only is it literally true that "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain" sympathetically until now, but God Himself feels the pain of sparrows (Matt. x. 29) and of all our human suffering and sin.[1] He shares its stab with us. "I know your sorrows" is Nature's Gospel, as well as the Bible's. Surely, this speaks of a God-Heart.

But, it will be urged, if Nature's evolution proclaims such a good and wise God as you make out, why could He not have made a world free of all its evil and pain?

> "O me! for why is all around us here
> As if some lesser God had made the world
> And had not force to shape it as He would?"

This is not the proper place for the discussion of this inscrutable problem. It can only be intelligently approached with some clear knowledge of what we mean by Personality in God and man, and to that we devote several chapters later on. Yet we must face the problem here, if we are to give any sort of answer to our question of a moment

[1] It is also true that, in every organic whole, virtue immediately goes out from the living energy of the soul and heals the diseased part.

ago: "Is the cosmic process, and the Power in or behind it, moral or immoral, good or bad?" This question naturally forms an integral part of our present cosmological argument, and we must glance at some of the pleas favouring a moral answer, even if we can only say at the end: "the cosmic process is good on the whole."[1]

Perhaps we must frankly admit, with Dr. Rashdall, that "this is the best of all *possible*, but not the best of all *imaginable* universes." This may seem to limit the omnipotence of God. Let us clearly understand what we mean by omnipotence, even in God. We usually think of God as Almighty; so He is. He can do or not do anything He wills to do or not do. But He can only will as His perfect character determines Him to will. There are some things impossible to God, or He would cease to be God. Few theologians would push their plea of Divine omnipotence so far as to insist that He could do anything self-contradictory or immoral. For example, God cannot repent or contradict Himself, tell a lie, make a square circle,

[1] Confessedly, the mystery is inscrutable. It has puzzled the deepest thinkers of all ages, and their hesitation to offer a solution is almost in exact proportion to the depth of their thought. Here, seers' intuitions help us much, brain-reasoning very little. It would be silly presumption on our part to fancy we can throw any but the faintest sidelights on this mystery.

undo the past, and so forth. God Himself limits His own omnipotence by refusing to reverse His own Laws of Nature, which are the direct expression of His thought and will.

So when we are told we are limiting God's omnipotence by calling this the best of all possible, not of all imaginable universes, the plea is not convincing. As soon as God included man, a free spirit, in His scheme of the universe, He there and then freely limited His omnipotence. And if God is, as for the moment we assume Him to be, all that we usually mean by God,—eternal, absolute, infinite,—His way was the only way and the best way, and for this reason. We commonly speak as if God had stopped to think of various possible ways of creating the universe and man, and finally chosen one way. This is an inconceivable conception. Creation was not a contingent and arbitrary act of this nature at all, but the necessary and essential outcome of God being what He is. Nature is God's thought and will made manifest; man is Spirit of God's Spirit. Both the one and the other were implicitly in God from all eternity.[1] From all eternity man was

[1] Cf. "Though earth and man were gone,
And suns and universes ceased to be,
And Thou wert left alone,
Every existence would exist in Thee" (E. Brontë).

in God, or as religion words it, from all eternity there was a Father-Son relationship in the Godhead. We have limited the Sonship to the Person of Christ, but in Him we must see mankind, of which S. Paul makes Him the archetype, the ideal representative.

Thus Nature, man, God are not three independent entities; they are essentially one. Nature is the visible thought and will of God; mankind is God the Infinite Spirit going out of Himself for self-expression in outgoing Love, and incarnating Himself in finite free spirits. If this be true, if Nature and man are the self-expression of a perfect God, then Dr. Rashdall's phrase: "This is the best of all possible, not of all imaginable worlds," is inadequate. No other universe is imaginable to Infinite Wisdom, though it may be to us.

For the moment, we shall waive this deep question of the human side of God's nature and the essential oneness of the human and divine natures. We shall also use the popular language of religious thought, and speak of finite spirits as created by an act of God's Will at a given moment of finite time. It is not only inaccurate, but misleading, for it suggests that there was a time when God's Love had less scope than now, that is, God was less God than now, a repellent and impossible

idea. But the use of the popular term 'creation' will not affect our argument.

God is Infinite Spirit.[1] Now the essential note of true spirit is outgoing love. A solitary and self-sufficient Infinite Spirit or God is an inconceivable conception of God. A spiritual being would cease to be true spirit if it did not find its life in the life of others. It is of the very essence of spirit to go forth out of self and bestow all the hidden wealth of which its nature is capable upon other spirits, receiving back that gift redoubled by being shared and reciprocated. This and this alone is spiritual life. It is the whole personality going out of itself and seeking another that it may give to that other all within itself that is best worth giving. And in the eyes of the true lover the person loved is an end in himself, not a means. He is loved absolutely for his own sake, not for any satisfaction our love to him may give us. Self-sacrifice is the note of spirit. It finds its life in losing it; it dies to live; it sinks self and blots it out to realise it.

God created man because He is Infinite Spirit, a God of Love. Love must go out of self to a being capable of being loved with all that love,

[1] Spirit and Person are identical and = Mind + Heart + Will.

and of reciprocating it. Such love can naturally only be between 'spirits' or 'persons.' If the object of our love is to be worthy of it, he must be 'another self like our self,' capable of receiving all that there is in us to bestow. Thus a Personal God Who is Mind + Heart + Will, when He willed out of the riches of His Love to create man for full communion with Himself, had to create him with a mind and heart and will of his own, a free self-conscious Personality even as Himself. Nothing short of the spontaneous love of a free personality, freely given, can satisfy God's Love; and man's reciprocation of God's Love cannot be thus free unless man is a free moral being with a free-will of his own. That is, instead of one Will-Centre, there must now be a multiplicity of will-centres, incarnate free spirits capable of acting on their own initiative.

Now it is precisely in His bestowal of this gift of freedom to man that God has voluntarily limited His own omnipotence. Nothing short of the spontaneous love of a free personality freely given can satisfy God's Love. Under these conditions imposed upon Himself by God, He cannot force man's will to be this or to do that, and yet expect him to be a moral being growing to the full height of his stature, and worthy of His Love. Moral

perfection is, and can only be, the outcome of a steady course of free and right choices on man's own part. God can make man *capable* of moral perfection, but this perfection must be self-realised, it cannot be created. Even God cannot create a moral character ready-made; else it would be His and not the man's, and cease to be moral. An innocent being and a moral being are not necessarily convertible terms.

Thus man's freedom is a *sine quâ non* in God's scheme. But freedom of will involves the possibility of wrong as well as of right choice. I, as an independent will-centre, may will and act in a way that runs counter to God's Will, and therefore counter to the good of the world-order or organic whole of which I am a member.[1] I may will selfishly, pit my will against God's Will consciously or unconsciously, set up private selfish claims of my own. Self-conscious selfishness of will is what we call sin. And if I sin, I must needs suffer, for I at once put myself out of gear with the cosmic scheme which runs on moral lines, since it is a moral

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Existence is like the output from a loom. The pattern is, in some sort, there already; but, whereas our looms are mere machines, once the guiding cards have been fed into them, the loom of Time is complicated by many free agents who can modify the web, making it more beautiful or more ugly as they are in harmony or disharmony with the general scheme. This is the price paid for freedom."

organic whole with God's Will as its vital principle. I am for the time being a sick and disorderly member of God's world-order, and it is so arranged as to rectify such disorders summarily.

In giving man the gift of freedom, or soul-directivity, God foresaw the possibility of evil as a consequence not to be avoided, a necessary stage on the road to the realisation of the ideal He had in view. Only thus could man become a free finite spirit, capable and worthy of God's Love and full communion with Him.

Paradoxical as it sounds, sin is indirectly the outcome of God's Love. Just because God meant man to be a moral being, He also meant him to know good *and evil*; for good can only first emerge as the victory over evil. It *is* by the discovery of evil, rather than of good, that we enter upon the moral life. The Genesis myth of the Fall is absolutely true in idea, and truth of idea is truer than truth of fact. Man starts in a state of nature, following animal-like the dictates of his appetites, as unconscious of right and wrong as the animals around him. A moment comes, the moment of moments in man's spiritual evolution, when it dawns upon him that he has done wrong. Hitherto he has been "naked and not ashamed"; now he is ashamed, for the first time self-conscious of a qualm within.

There and then man parts from the brutes, and the First Man is born. He has taken the first step upward in the path of development, and he has done it by an act of wrong-doing. We call it the Fall, because man tripped over that upward step in the act of mounting it. But the mere fact that his eyes are now open to the knowledge of good and evil proves that God's Spirit has spoken to his spirit, now for the first time able to hear God's Voice. From that moment he may be still biologically akin to the brutes, but psychologically he is akin to God. He is a living soul. The child-spirit within can now hear the accusing voice of God the Father-Spirit in the garden of his soul in the cool of the day,—it is always as an accusing and judging voice we first hear it,—and all he has to do is to hearken to its promptings and identify himself with them. He has now bidden a definite farewell to the ape and started on his road to the God-likeness, though the way will be long and painful. But the forbidden fruit had to be eaten. There was no other way: "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Only through the door of temptation, the storm of remorse, the discipline of sorrow, the sense of dependence and trust in God thus initiated, could man become MAN.

In this sense only can we say that God creates evil (Is. xlv. 7), or permits it for the sake of the moral good which could not otherwise be achieved. Evil is here, not as a thing that ought to be, but as a thing that ought not to be, and yet must be, because its presence is conducive to a greater excellence of moral personality than is possible or conceivable without it. Not otherwise can moral perfection and attainment be won than through the overcoming of imperfections and by endless strivings, an infinite series of true and right choices.

But if evil is here, it is here expressly to be got rid of, to be destroyed by searching it out and fighting it to the death and wringing out of it a victory of which it is the only possible condition. For only when it is beaten does evil become an element in the total good of the world. In logical phrase, evil is not a 'property' of the world, only an 'accident' to be got rid of; and God's world-order is arranged with a view to its conquest and eradication. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain" until it is got rid of. This is true to fact; moreover the world-order is stronger than man's evil, and checks and neutralises that evil, so that we conspire with God even when we most rebel against Him. Defiance of God's physical and moral laws spells misery and death, and stimulates man's

moral energy, rousing true souls to combat and eradicate these social evils.[1]

Viewed in this light, we can see that, with all its sin and imperfection, the world of erring men, striving against sin and little by little wresting a progressive moral victory over it, is an immeasurably finer place than a world of protected, shielded, temptationless innocents. And God wants moral men and women, not automata; personalities, not puppets.

As we have already seen, God is no idle spectator in the world's tragedy of evil and pain. As the Source, Life and Soul of the organic whole of which we are members, every time we sin or mourn, He shares the stab with us. But He does more than this. In every organism, as soon as an organ is hurt, virtue immediately flows from the soul's vitality to the wounded or diseased member and the healing process begins. So it is with us and God. He suffers in sympathy with our sin and pain, and immediately virtue goes out of Him for our healing, if we will but let that virtue do its perfect work.

W. Temple has beautifully expressed the same

[1] As the bravest soldier is most exposed to wounds, so it is he who most bravely and effectively combats the evils, folly, and malice of the world, who always suffers most. Like Christ, he comes to his own to save them, and they know him not and crucify him. He gives his life a ransom for many, and is satisfied.

thought: "If God made the world, He must suffer with us, you exclaim. Yes, of course He suffers; look at the Cross. You add: If He is our Father, His Heart must break. Yes, of course, it does break, look at the Cross." We may add: If He is our Maker and Father, He must heal us. Yes, of course, He does heal; look at the Cross again. He heals our evil without forcing our wills. He refuses to surrender the love of His unloving children and means to win it. How? By the revelation of a grief, a compassion, a love so intense that no human heart can resist its appeal.

To sum up. Moral evil, or the pitting of man's self-will against God's good Will, is here as a salutary instrument with a view to our best good, to teach us, by sad and painful experience, that it does not do to set up our own petty ends as idols for ourselves and others to serve. The lesson is terribly hard to learn, but a day comes when evil has done its work, and wrought its own undoing, by forcing us to bend our will to God's Will and thus find a service which is our perfect freedom. For what does "Not my will, but Thine be done" mean, but the discovery that our true self-expression is to be at one with the Self from whom we spring, and thus at one with all other selves and the world-order? In short, evil is here to do away with evil, and when its

perfect work is done, God's Kingdom will be fully established.

Here we leave this inscrutable problem, with all its difficulties still unsolved. All said and done, the 'eye of the soul' sees truer and deeper into this mystery than all the 'eyes of the brain.'[1] Even as there are moments when Job's halting words, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him," help us more than the Psalmist's facile optimism with its "never saw I the righteous forsaken," so it is here. My brain does not catch God's deep meaning in the world's evil and pain, yet what I do understand of His cosmic process makes me sure that even here He has a very good purpose, and I can fully trust Him. I do know that Nature is oft 'red in tooth and claw.' I know, too, that she knows nothing of indulgence, makes no concessions to ignorance, folly or weakness. She insists on obedience to her laws, and promptly wipes out all who dare set themselves in opposition to her physical or moral arrangements. She seems, not a kind parent, but a stern step-mother. Yet Science's own watchwords: "evolu-

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Truth did not begin to arrive on this planet a few centuries ago with the dawn of science. The pre-scientific insight of genius—of prophets and poets and saints—is of supreme value, and the access of these inspired seers to the heart of the universe is profound." Cf. "Let others reason, and welcome! 'tis we musicians know."

tion," "survival of the fittest," prove that Nature's severity is not malevolent, but benign. It is precisely the pull and push, the toil and trial of her stern schooling that evoke courage, exertion, goodness, self-sacrifice. This, and nothing else, has lifted this glorious world out of the mud, making it the training-school of character, the nurse of men in the image of God.

Here ends the first part of our cosmological argument. Nature has led us some considerable way on our road to a personal God, but she plainly indicates that if we wish her to put us on the right track of the Personal God our heart yearns for, we must focus our gaze on that which is highest in herself—self-conscious man.[1] Elsewhere, the God Nature reveals is only an indwelling God closely akin to the God of Pantheism, and, as already said, we want more than an idealised World-Reason or World-Soul. We want a God who is transcendent as well as immanent, and we shall never grasp His immanence till we grasp His transcendence. And it is only through the door of our reason and conscience that we can escape from the semi-Pantheism

[1] Cf. "All tended to mankind,
And, man produced, all has its end thus far,
But in completed man begins anew
A tendency to God" (Browning).

of nature. It is only through the voice of conscience within us, the "categorical imperative" which sides with the good and the right against evil and wrong, that we *know* God is altogether good and holy. So if we want to know God as a loving and righteous Personal Father, in us yet far above us, we must look for Him, not in the visible things of nature, but within our inmost heart. "Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? or who shall descend into the deep? For the word of God is nigh thee, even in thine own heart." This was Paul's creed. "He who reflects upon himself," says Plotinus, "reflects upon his own original, and finds the impression of the eternal nature and perfect Being stamped upon his own soul." "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord, lighted of God, and lighting us to God" (Proverbs).

"To find God, look within yourself," is a good and true rule, but there are two facts we must bear in mind: (1) there are two selves inside us; (2) we only see there what we bring eyes to see.—Let us just glance at these two points.

(1) *Man's dual personality.*—We are spirit of God's Spirit, but there is an animal-self as well as a God-self inside us. We are the lineal children, biologically, of apes, and, as Tennyson puts it, our body is "the house of a brute let to the soul of a

man." Spirituality is not our first nature, but our second. "First the natural, then the spiritual." "What is self?" can only be answered as a saint answered a request to allow his portrait to be painted: "Which man do you want to paint? One is not worth painting, and the other is not nearly finished yet."

True, we are "in the image of God," but our likeness to Him exists only very potentially as yet. Already in His light we see light, and we could not even begin to work out our mental, moral or spiritual salvation were God's Spirit not already in us enabling us both to will and to do; but the divine spark is dimmed by our bad atmosphere. We have not yet "come to ourselves," as Christ so truly puts it, and dimly reflect the 'face of our birth.' We are half-God, half-brute.[1] What is worse, the brute in us is no longer the blind, unreflective, impulsive brute he was as a pure animal. In self-conscious man, he is now a thinking brute.[2] In man, self-indulgence loses its original animal simplicity and innocence and becomes deliberate self-indulgence, for appetite and passion are now

[1] Cf. Huxley: "Men are queer animals; a mixture of horse-nervousness, ass-stubbornness, and camel malice, with an angel bobbing about like an apple in the posset."

[2] This is why man rises infinitely above brutes, or sinks far below them.

armed with reason. No man can serve two masters, and here are two masters within one personality, locked up in the same self, each claiming the man as their own. As Hegel vividly puts it: "I am at once the combatants and the conflict and the field that is torn with the strife,—the serf who struggles to be free, the tyrant that enslaves him, and the scene of the internecine conflict between them."[1]

(2) *We only see what we have eyes to see.*—Psychology will help us to read our hearts, but all the psychology in the world will never by itself lead us to see God there, though He *is* there. "The pure in heart see God," and He is only seen with the 'eye of the soul.' Sensuality and selfishness and all forms of conscious moral evil blind the soul's eye, and kill its sight and light just as truly as all light goes out in a poisoned physical atmosphere. "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." Only he who "thinks the thought that is highest and earnestly strives to live the thought he thinks," can hope to have the inner light which will enable him to see the truth that makes us free. An old writer quaintly says: "The

[1] Cf. Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*, and Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*; or each man is two selves, one pointing to the sky, the other to the sty. One says, "Be true to the best in you"; the other, "Be true to the beast in you."

Spirit of God can only ride in His own chariot," and if you would have Him dwell in your heart as His home, you must attune yourself to that Spirit and give it free scope. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

As it is with animals that live long in dark caves, the eye may be there, yet become atrophied through lack of use. Some men have lost the sight of this eye of the soul, just as some men have lost all ear for music. We can 'muddle through' life without it. It is an absolute necessity for the full growth of the whole man, but it is not an immediate necessity for our material existence in this world, and that is all some care for. But of this you may be sure, God *is* in your heart, but see Him there you never will till your own spirit is responsive to and receptive of His Spirit knocking at the door of your heart. Just as it entirely depends upon ourselves, upon our own character, how much of other people we can see when they are there before us, so it is here. God may be before us in all the beauty of His love and holiness and we see Him not. "Our contentment with the finite may incase us like a lobster-shell and shield us from all repining at our distance from God," as William James says in his *Varieties of Religious Experience* with reference to a hard-headed practical man, capable of threading his way

through the lower and everyday channels of worldly life, but as little conscious of spirituality as a brute. So it is true that, if we want to find God, we must look within the inmost sanctuary of our personality; but there are personalities and personalities, and you will never find Him within you if your spiritual consciousness is undeveloped or atrophied.

In Chaper V. we shall try to see what man's personality has to tell him of God.

CHAPTER IV

RELIGION AND SCIENCE

A

"PURE and undiluted subjectivity!" exclaims the scientist as he reads our last paragraphs. "Sheer make-believe! Your God is only yourself written large. You are flinging yourself out of yourself to meet this 'other self' whom you call God, and you do not see that your supernatural is purely your own creation!"

But is it all make-believe, the unconscious creation of our subconscious self? In this chapter and the next we hope to show, both on scientific and psychological grounds, that our religious heart-facts are far more real than the facts of science. Reality is other and larger than science fancies, and the human mind has other and larger faculties than those for which science finds use.[1]

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Science is systematised and *metrical* knowledge, and in regions where measurement cannot be applied it has little

In a passage already quoted, Sir O. Lodge reminds Science that it is presumptuous on her part to dogmatise as if she had a monopoly of facts, and knew all that is to be known of 'things' and 'mind,' whereas she never comes into close grip with either things or mind. "It is the presumptuous exercise of the kind of intelligence Science uses, a limited intelligence only possible to a certain very practical and useful order of brain, which has good solid work of a commonplace kind to do in the world, and has been restricted in its outlook, let us say by Providence, in order that it may do that one thing and do it well."

Sir O. Lodge is himself an eminent scientist and can criticise the limitations of science in words no layman dare use, but there is truth in his statement. Science has to be reminded of her limitations and also to learn that there is mental as well as physical science. There is an activity of the brain which science uses, and there is an activity of the will with which religion deals. Life asks for the whole of man and cannot dispense with emotions, aspirations, resolves, which science ignores. Science's 'judgments of existence' have their place in life,

scope. Emotion and intuition and instinct are immensely older than science, and in a comprehensive survey of existence cannot be ignored."

but Reason's 'judgments of value'[1] are three-quarters of life. Hence the saying: "We use science, we live by Religion."

Religion and Science have ever been on the war-path, for ever crossing swords. It almost seems as if there never could be any but an armed truce between them; their provinces, method and temper so differ and clash. Science, we are told, deals with hard facts, Religion with fanciful theories; Science appeals to reason, Religion to the feelings and imagination.

Is this true? Does Science place before us real objective facts? Are the assertions of Religion mere make-believe, "a kind of poetry, a kind of guess, intuition, inspiration perhaps, but not a link in a chain of assured and reasoned knowledge"? Is there really a feud between Religion proper and Science proper? May not the main reason for the alleged feud be that we have (1) too narrowly tied down the term 'science' to the physical sciences, and (2) identified Religion with its theological dogmas? "The antagonism of Science," says

[1] There is a region of our experience where results are so constant that disagreement about them is impossible; *e.g.* $2+2=4$; "water seeks its own level"; these are matter-of-fact 'judgments of existence.' There is another region where the complexity of the subject-matter makes unanimity of opinion hard; *e.g.* "Is the world good on the whole and progressively so?" These = 'judgments of value.'

Huxley, "is not to Religion, but to the heathen survivals and bad philosophy under which Religion herself is well-nigh crushed."

At times in these pages we may seem to belittle science. This is very far from our real intention. Religion and Philosophy are too apt offensively to twit Science with her limitations. It might be wiser for them to copy her cautious and reasoned methods and temper, and take her as a model of what the true sifting and weighing of evidence means in the quest for Truth.

Our quarrel is not with science proper, but with a bad philosophy parading under the name of science. So long as Science confines herself to her true province, she speaks with authority. It is only when she oversteps her self-appointed bounds, leaves the realm of physical fact and begins to weave philosophical theories, when she reaches the point where scientific research ends and metaphysics begins, that her logic flounders and she is apt to become a blind leader of the blind.

What is the province of science proper? Science is the formulated knowledge of the phenomena of the universe as they appear to us,[1] and it is her concern to trace uniformities and successions in these phenomena, to formulate the laws of Nature

[1] *i.e.* the reasoned study of data supplied by the senses.

and of physical causation. As Professor Thomson openly admits · "The aim of science is not to explain, merely to redescribe in simpler terms." Science observes a world developing, and she formulates the law of its actual development as it appears to the observant eye. There she stops and frankly admits that it is not for her to go behind actual facts and tell us the cause of the universe or its purpose, why it is here or whither it is tending, for the instruments and methods at her disposal are not adequate to that task.

The aim of Philosophy, on the other hand, is to start where science ends, to take the data of science respecting phenomena into her reckoning and discover what lies behind these phenomena as their ground or cause, how and why things are what they are, to trace the ultimate origin and purpose of the universe.[1] Science assumes there is a world as the object of our knowledge. Philosophy asks what *is* knowledge and what *is* the world, and how do we know there is a world at all?

So long as science and philosophy keep to their respective spheres, they agree perfectly and respect each other. Philosophy readily hands over to

[1] A. J. Balfour defines philosophy as "the unification of all belief into an ordered whole, compacted into one ordered structure under the stress of reason."

science the realm of physical phenomena and accepts the verified conclusions of science. It is only when Science goes out of her way to invade the province of Philosophy, begins to dogmatise about the First Cause and ultimate purpose of all things, and makes vain pretensions to an infallible omniscience which Science proper is the first to disclaim, that Philosophy protests and resents the arrogant claim.

By way of illustration, take the evolution-theory. Science tells us: This is how the world evolved, as careful observation shows. From a hot cloud or nebula comes our solar system. This Earth is the Sun's child and derives all its material elements from the Sun. As our globe cooled, vegetation and animals appeared on it. We can trace all organic life from amœba to man in one line of unbroken continuity. Nature is uniform and her key-note is the Reign of Law.

These are verified scientific facts about physical phenomena, and they have come to stay. We gladly accept them. Science here speaks with the authoritative voice of an expert in her own department.

But Science oversteps her limits as soon as she leaves her department and tells us dogmatically: Matter is eternal and the ultimate principle of all

that is. Reason itself is matter's by-product. There is no intelligent mind in or behind the universe. All is the outcome of the redistribution of matter in motion worked on by blind Force.

Here we have Science's sense-data carried into a region which sense-data cannot possibly explore. Ask the true scientist: Is there, or is there not, a First Cause? Where did matter and life come from? What is the final goal of man? Does spirit continue to exist with the death of the body, or do body and spirit die together? To all these questions he candidly replies: I do not know. Our work as scientists is merely descriptive, to say how things have actually evolved; of ultimate origins or purposes we know nothing. We only deal with such "secondary causes" as lie within the field of actual observation and experiment. Your questions fall within the province of religion and philosophy. As scientists, we leave them severely alone, for we have no verified data of our own enabling us to link matter to mind, or mind to God. We do not deny the existence of what you call a First Cause. We suspect its existence, but as scientists we neither affirm nor deny it, because our methods and evidence are insufficient in themselves to prove the existence of such a Power. But ours is only one of the

departments of human knowledge, and a limited one. We have no grudge against other departments and other modes of knowledge. The only stipulation we make is that when Philosophy or Religion come to deal with our department, they shall accept our facts so far as they go, and also be as careful in sifting and weighing their facts as we are to verify ours.

A science of this type commands our reverent admiration. It is Religion's truest ally. The science we do not respect is that of a certain materialistic school, *e.g.* Haeckel's and Buchner's, where imagination makes wild guesses far removed from science's sober verified facts, yet masquerades as science pure and simple. Thus Buchner tells us in his *Last Words on Materialism*, that whatever we know or ever can know, however deeply we may probe and unfold the secrets of the Universe, 'matter' is the terminus to which all knowledge and research must lead. All thought, all imagination, all aspiration, whatsoever things are high and good, all life and the attributes of life are "but the manifestations of the simple monistic basis of all things which remains one and the same in itself throughout all the changes and diversity of its phenomena." There is nothing in the universe but matter and force; all that is, is derivable from these

two primitive factors which are the Alpha and Omega of existence.[1]

Such materialism takes the terms and postulates which Science proper finds it convenient and helpful to employ, because they answer her purely practical purposes and serve as good 'working assumptions,' —viz. such terms as 'matter,' 'force,' 'motion,'— and, in its mental incapacity to get behind these postulates to their ultimate significance, it dogmatically asserts that they are *ultimate* facts. This is a position which Science proper stoutly repudiates. She professes to know nothing of ultimate facts. After saying her last word on the world's orderly development, the ceaseless chain of physical causation, the fixity of natural law, and so forth, she eagerly adds that behind all this there remains a whole series of facts on which she has nothing to say. Haeckel and his school resent this admission of her limitations on Science's part, and cut the Gordian knot at one stroke with their dogmatic

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Science studies matter and its laws. Matter is what appeals to our senses here and now, and it alone; for all things, life itself, can only here manifest itself as matter. Thus materialism is appropriate to a material world as a 'working creed.' But our scientific studies do not exhaust the universe, and if we negatively dogmatise, and say we can reduce everything to physics and chemistry, we gibbet ourselves as ludicrously narrow pedants. Our scientific explanations are only proximate, not ultimate."

assertion: Matter is all in all; life is matter; mind is matter. There is no God and no need of His meddling interference; the Universe is a self-sufficient universe independent of anything but itself for its maintenance, meaning, or origin. To use his actual words: "Science has conducted God to its frontiers, thanking Him for His provisional services."

Unfortunately, this shallow philosophy with its romancing speculations, yet calling itself scientific, appeals strongly to the man in the street for two main reasons: (1) it speaks in plain terms, and (2) in the name of Science. The man in the street loves what he calls 'common-sense,' and is awed by what looks and sounds scientific. For him, Science is the final court of appeal; her facts are so accurate and solid, while she gives chapter and verse for all her pronouncements. Hence her discoveries, even her provisional hypotheses, are viewed as necessary and final truths. The man in the street knows Haeckel to be an eminent man of science, and so he is; but the man in the street cannot distinguish between Haeckel's scientific facts and his speculations. They are both the utterance of an eminent scientist and therefore equally true.

Materialism is all the more dangerous a guide to the unwary because there is a large grain of truth in

its assertions, and no lie is so dangerous as a half truth. It *is* true that Nature starts from nebular molecules as her raw material and never stops till she produces man as her masterpiece. It *is* true that inorganic Nature is a machine. It *is* true that mind is, in point of time, a late apparition. It *is* true that, as we know it, mind is never apart from matter. It *is* true that our mental and moral evolution is the outcome of brute feelings and instincts, traces of which are to be found even in plants. These are solid facts of science. We are even ready to see, with Haeckel, in matter the potentiality of all things, life and mind included, but the definition of matter will in that case be totally different from Haeckel's.

Materialism is all based on the assumption that matter is essentially what it appears to our senses, a concrete objective fact, an ultimate reality. This is a perfectly gratuitous hypothesis. Most people are absolutely convinced that a tree, or a stone, or matter in any form is in itself exactly as they see it. "Seeing is believing" clinches all argument. As a matter of fact no material object is in itself in the least like what we see it. We fancy it is, simply because we are the children of thousands of generations of ancestors who have laboured under this delusion and moulded our belief for us so deeply

that it is almost ineradicable. But the belief is hollow and based on an absolutely unwarrantable and wrong assumption.

The arguments in proof of this statement are not easy to set forth in such simple terms that he who runs may read and understand. They take us into the realm of mind, and psychology does not admit of easy exposition. "In philosophy truth is deep and simplicity fallacious," and in philosophy lies the clue to our problem, or nowhere.

Philosophy seeks to unify and bind together all our beliefs into one harmonious organic whole by discovering one root-principle of which they are one and all the partial expression. For instance, if our reading of the Universe-evolution is true, it all flows from one root-principle, the creative, directive consciousness which we call God. Nature is the thought and will of God made manifest to our senses; man is God's Consciousness welling up in ourselves, as in all organic life; and Nature, man, God thus become one harmonious rational organic whole. In short, philosophy seeks to penetrate beneath the surface-show of things right to their very heart and essence; to see not what seems, but what is, and why it is; to find the ultimate ground and reason of all things in some root-principle which embraces all that is, indwells in it all, yet transcends it all. Thus

philosophy traces back all things to one ultimate principle from which they all naturally and necessarily flow, so that as soon as we grasp that principle we see the universe as an organic whole, an intelligently articulated system.

In this way philosophy tries to bring unity and harmony into the scattered thoughts of our general culture. For practical purposes of life, we all specialise, that is, we apply ourselves to the study of some one branch of knowledge, and sort our knowledge in each department into pigeon-holes labelled by the names of the different sciences. This enables each department to do its little part and to do it well. But it is apt to make us consider the parts in and by themselves and out of relation to the whole whose parts they are. Philosophy steps in to rectify this narrowing defect and insists on seeing things together in the light of the whole, thus relating the parts to the whole and to each other.

In order to do this effectively, it has to examine the conceptions from which the single sciences start, and see how far they are right or wrong. For instance, physical science takes the current popular terms: 'matter,' 'atoms,' 'cause,' 'force,' in their ordinary popular sense, as her working assumptions. Philosophy, or reflective human thought,

asks: Is this view of the independent concrete reality of matter correct, or is it an unwarrantable assumption borrowed from the language and thought of unreflective everyday life?

These are metaphysical problems we would gladly avoid, but they have to be faced, for the point at issue is one of vital moment affecting the deepest human interests. Once disprove the independent existence of matter, and the whole edifice of materialism crumbles like a house of cards.

B

Materialism professes to give us objective facts, that is, a representation of things so identical with things as they are in themselves that you can no more question its truth than you can question the mathematical formula $(x+y)^2=x^2+2xy+y^2$.

Now the question is: Are the facts of materialism, nay more, are the facts of physical science, 'objective facts'? Can Science know things and place them before us exactly as they are in themselves? How can she?

An objective fact may roughly be defined as absolute identity of thought with its object. It is to know things as they are in themselves, so that our knowledge and thought of them is uncoloured

by anything derived from our own mind. The subjective element must be entirely eliminated. You cannot call your knowledge of anything outside yourself an objective fact, till you have stripped that knowledge of every element and contribution derived from your own thought.

Now the facts with which physical science deals, or the phenomema of Nature, lie outside the human mind. How are we to endow the human mind with so undiluted and exact a copy of these external things as to constitute absolute identity with them, and so obtain our mathematical equation x (my thought of y) $= y$? To do this we must reduce the subjective element, all thought on our part, to zero; make our mind a passive instrument. Can we thus convert our mind into a photographic plate, so that the objects may imprint themselves on it exactly as they are and give us our 'objective facts'? If we cannot, then our data are not absolutely true and exact, only relatively true at best. There is *correspondence* between our mental picture of things and things as they are, but no identity, and it is an ill-defined correspondence at that.

Our mind does not thus passively mirror things exactly as they are. This is a feat mentally and physically impossible, and worse than useless even if it could be done.

(1) *It is a mentally impossible feat.*—We shall presently see that our organs of sense,—our eyes, ears, hands, etc.—are our channels of communication with the outside world. These only give us fleeting and isolated sensations. But isolated and fleeting sensations are not knowledge. If this were all, our consciousness would be but the stage across which flitted one by one an endless series of fugitive impressions; first A, then B, then C, then D, each monopolising us for the time, then vanishing tracelessly to give place to a successor, a successor which would be no successor, seeing that no trace or record of its predecessor would remain to us. A series of fleeting, unrelated, incoherent sensations of this kind, chasing and obliterating each other, is not the stuff out of which we can ever build even the tiniest particle of real knowledge. You might as well speak of the knowledge of a photographic camera.

In order to have any real knowledge at all, these fleeting sensations must somehow be caught, related, locked together into an organic whole. This is exactly what our creative consciousness, of which these sensations are but states or moments, does for us. It locks all these fleeting sensations tightly together in the unity of thought, and reclaims them from chaos by arresting, combining, comparing and

relating them into one rational organic whole. Thus an element or contribution of thought is essential to make possible even the minimum of knowledge of any object whatsoever. In our simplest sense-perception of an external object our mind contributes a great deal, though our sensations are often so absorbing that at the time we do not realize this mental contribution.

In another way we can see that we never get at the raw material of things and that our idea of them is always a mind-manufactured article. Our mind is so constituted that it instinctively turns out all the objects of its knowledge and experience stamped with certain forms, moulds, categories of thought inherent in the mind itself. We project our own personality into the reality outside us, anthropomorphise it, read into the external world what we have already found in ourselves. We so stamp our personality upon it that in a sense we create what we find in it. Smile as we will at primitive man's personification of Nature, the twentieth-century philosopher is doing the same thing to-day.

For example, we find Uniformity and Causality in Nature. Why? The *suggestion* came from within ourselves. Each of us is aware that he is one and the same self through all the changes and chances

of life-experience. The human mind instinctively projects this idea of unity into Nature, seeks there what it finds in its own personality. Uniformity is not so plainly written on Nature's face that he who runs may read it there. But the human mind, conscious of its own unity which makes man call himself 'I,' imperatively demanded it in Nature also, and sought for it long and diligently before, here a little and there a little, he found it there.— So with Causality. Man early discovered that as soon as his will gave an order, his muscles and limbs somehow set to work to carry out that order and some action followed. Finding in our will the cause of our own activity, we seek a similar phenomenon in Nature. There again, Causality, no more than Uniformity, is not so plainly written on Nature's face that he who runs may read it there. In our experience of Nature we meet with nothing but succession; certain antecedents are accompanied by certain consequents. On the analogy of what we find in ourselves, we demand causality in Nature and seek it diligently and find it there.

Does this reading into Nature of what we find in our own consciousness put into Nature what is not there and thus invalidate our interpretation of Nature? Not at all. As we have frequently suggested already, and shall see more clearly in the

sequel, Nature, man, God are one organic whole, and God's Consciousness is the key and meaning of it all, its root-principle. Man's mind and God's mind are one in essence, and Nature is God's Thought. Now it is precisely because Nature is the realised thought of a Mind akin to our own mind, that our mind can read and interpret Nature correctly and find the notes of Mind and Will stamped upon it, for they are there. Thus, although our ideas of Uniformity and Causality in Nature are the suggestion of our own personality, we do not arbitrarily impose these ideas on Nature; yet, without such a suggestion from within ourselves, sense-experience would never have discovered causality and uniformity in Nature. So our scientific knowledge of Nature presents the strange spectacle of a creed believed to be due to one set of reasons, viz. that the objective facts of Nature have forced our views upon us, whereas it can only be justified by what is exactly the reverse, viz. that we have forced ourselves upon Nature.

(2) *It is a physically impossible feat.*—We have seen that it is *mentally* impossible for us to know the objective facts of things. It is an equally impossible *physical* feat, so long as our mind is pent in a material body and can only hold converse with Nature through our physical senses. To give a

simple and popular illustration. Our eyes see colour, our ears hear sounds, our hands feel a solidity in objects, yet these sensations are all sense-illusions. Colour and sound do not exist as they appear to us. It is we who manufacture the colour of a dahlia and the boom of a bell. A bell makes no sound at all. Colour and sound are but vibrations of ether and air. A sunset is only a molecular agitation of the ether, a symphony a molecular agitation of the air.

So it is with all our physical senses and their reports. Yet sensations and inferences from sensations or states of mind are all we have to go upon for our knowledge of the outer world. Paradoxical as it sounds, no one has ever seen or touched matter. Our firm conviction that matter is as we see and feel it to be, is the child of long habit and predispositions inherited from tens of thousands of generations of ancestors. Critically examine this firm conviction and it will crumble to pieces, lose precision, and vanish into an elusive mist. Our whole idea of the Universe, from a dewdrop to the Sun, is built up of mind-manufactured sensations, sights and sounds, tastes and odours, pleasures and pains, sensations of motion and resistance, which are no more identical with the objects outside us that occasion them than these written pages are identical

with my thoughts. They are good symbols of them, that is all.

For us the only certain facts are our thoughts and feelings. These *are* real objective facts at first hand; all else is deduction or inferences from our states of mind. All we can do is to interpret, very imperfectly and inadequately, the messages which the Reality outside us flashes to our consciousness in the form of the stimulating sensations we experience. Every one of these sensations or *stimuli* comes to us through distorting channels,—eyes, ears, nose, hands, brains, nerves,—which colour and tamper with the message. Thus our mind has to judge on poor evidence badly reported, discount much of this evidence, and intuitively frame its own conclusions. We can easily see that our knowledge of the outside world is in no wise identical with it. As already said, there is correspondence, not identity, between the two.

Of the reality of our sensations there can be no shadow of a doubt. It is equally certain that they are in many instances the outcome of causes outside us, an outside Reality. But this need not consist of 'matter.' I see an orange and call it soft, yellow, sweet, odorous. Now I know that the colour, taste, smell, solidity I attribute to it are all inferences from sensations I experience. They are sense-illusions,

mind-manufactured and artificial elements I introduce into the orange. Why should we believe that the orange's form or extension is any more real? This does not make oranges, or sunsets, or symphonies one whit sham oranges or sunsets. All it implies is that, much in the same way as when a scientist describes the hues of a sunset as a molecular agitation of the ether, so all the Reality outside me is something essentially different from the picture into which my mind manufactures it for me. My mental picture of it is an artificial mind-manufactured article, a symbol of the Reality, nothing more. It certainly is not the real objective fact which physical science and materialism call it.

Clearly, then, if there is a world of matter, it is a mentally and physically impossible feat for us to know it as it is. We can go further than this. The very existence of matter at all, as the independent entity on which physical science lays so much stress, is more than an open question and a perfectly gratuitous hypothesis. To-day one school of science frankly questions its existence, even as human thought has questioned it in all ages. Many of our most eminent scientists now see in matter no matter at all, only 'points of force.' And as Croll says: "What is force other than a manifestation of will?

Thus matter is in fact resolved into will and idea, and the radical distinction between spirit and matter abolished."[1]

But the idea of 'matter' as a real and ultimate entity is so part and parcel of ourselves, so ingrained in our language and identified with 'common-sense,' that the ordinary practical educated Englishman will not even allow the question to be broached. 'Facts' for him are what he sees with his own eyes, and a yellow, soft, sweet, round orange is his norm and type of reality. As Father Waggett pithily puts it: he "reserves the word 'real' for a cheese or the smell of it, and refuses it, as oft as not, to our spiritual emotions." In this state of mind, matter presents itself as the one solid reality, something undeniable and vastly important, while thinking and willing, emotions and aspirations, are negligible quantities. Tell this man that he has never seen or handled matter, and such teaching is to him foolishness. Words and the force of habit and inherited predispositions lead him by the nose. Even if he does listen to this bewildering talk, dimly grasps its drift and partly believes, he naturally asks: After all, what does it matter? The old view works out right in practice, and that is the best test of value. Of what earthly use are these

[1] Croll, *Basis of Evolution*, p. 47. The italics are his own.

metaphysical hair-splittings? I prefer sober English common-sense to metaphysics made in Germany.

What does it matter? It is a matter of life and death! If materialism is true and matter is the ultimate basis of all that is, life and spirit included, then "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Prof. L. Buchner openly asserts it is so in his *Last Words on Materialism.* Life and spirit, he tells us, is only a form of material activity, like heat or electricity; something that ceases to exist in the individual at the stage of natural progress which we call death; consciousness apart from a material brain is impossible, and to think of a Personal Deity "gives us the paradoxical picture of a gaseous vertebrate."

On the other hand, if Mind is the source of matter, if Mind is and has always been the soul of the universe, then "Spirit thou art, hast always been, and ever wilt be."

Is it immaterial which view you hold? Whichever of these two views you adopt, it will colour and influence your whole character and the whole tenor of your life, making it totally different from what it would be had you adopted the other view. Neither the stars in their courses, nor the moral law in your heart; neither God, your neighbour, nor yourself

retain the values under the one which they hold under the other.[1]

For a reason already quoted half-a-dozen times, we disbelieve in the existence of matter as popularly conceived. Actual practice proves our knowledge of Nature correct, for it works out correctly when applied. Why does my thought of Nature correspond so closely with the reality? There can be but one intelligent answer. My mind can read and interpret Nature aright because Nature herself is realised Thought, the expression of an idea, *i.e.* essentially spiritual. This is the only solution of the problem which covers all the facts; and it gets rid of the dualism of mind + matter by unifying and explaining everything in terms of mind. Under the old view, not only do we have 'mind' and 'matter' as two rival and independent powers, but it becomes absolutely inconceivable how you can bridge the gulf between them and make matter evoke sensations in mind. This difficulty at once vanishes as soon as you realise that matter is mind. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned."

But to prick the bubble of materialism we need not prove as much as this. Far less will do, and it

[1] Cf. Prof. H. Jones: "Such is the unity of spiritual experience, even when it is not reflective, that no particular opinion can be adopted, rejected, or changed except by modifying the whole of that experience."

can be put in a form that all can understand and endorse. Even people who cannot believe that there is no such thing as matter, and find it a hard saying, may endorse another argument. Whenever a man says: "I see matter," he must own that the 'I' is invariably there as well as the 'matter.' You must *think* matter before it exists for you at all. It is always mind + matter that you know. Eliminate your creative consciousness and there is no matter in existence for you. Of course, this does *not* mean that the external world is an illusion, the phantasmal creation of your mind or mine. Nothing of the kind. What we call the external world is there, independent of you or me, or of what any human mind thinks of it, for its existence. Whether we are scientists or idealists, our one aim is to come into close relation and grip with it so as to know it and use it. All we insist upon is that no man, be he philosopher or scientist or man in the street, can possibly know it at all except through mind and in terms of mind.

If so—and who can doubt it?—what becomes of materialism's 'objective facts' and its insistence on matter as the ultimate reality? Physical science is realising this to-day. The modern scientific school still uses the old terms 'matter,' 'force,' 'cause and effect,' etc., but thins them down all it can and

carefully cautions us that the terms must not be pressed. Thus it turns 'cause and effect' into an equation. A terminology of some kind it must have, and so long as it is clearly understood that such terms as 'force' and 'matter' are mere useful counters or symbols, these terms which have been so long in use will do as well as any other. Similarly it views 'atoms' and 'ether,'[1] not as concrete realities, but as useful symbols, mere working assumptions. This new school has utterly discarded a mechanical interpretation of the universe, while it defines the rôle of science as 'description' and not 'explanation.' "The aim of science is not to explain, but to redescribe in simpler terms, to find a common denominator; but its interpretations are always in terms of conceptual formulæ, such as matter, ether, energy, chemical affinity, etc.—which are not themselves self-explanatory, which are, in fact, intellectual counters, symbols of the mysterious reality. . . . Scientific explanations do not deal with causes in the sense in which we speak of a personal agency as a cause."

Here is Prof. Thomson frankly admitting the two points at issue in this chapter. (1) Science does not profess to offer any explanation of the Universe at all, only a redescription of it in simpler terms.

[1] But see B. A. A. *re* Ether.

(2) Such scientific terms as 'matter,' 'force,' 'ether,' etc., are not to be understood as vouching for their existence as ultimate realities. The terms are only intellectual counters or symbols tentatively applied to Nature, useful working assumptions, valid and serviceable for the practical business of Science. They are not to be pressed as if Science viewed matter as an independent entity. She has nothing whatever to do with these philosophical problems.[1] On such moot points as: "is matter mind, or mind matter?" "What is the First Cause and what the final goal of the universe?"—Science sides neither with materialism nor idealism. It does not concern her.

It matters little to practical science, it matters much to Religion and Philosophy. Even for science the question is important. As A. J. Balfour has pointed out: The naturalistic assumption 'all is matter,' is not only illogical and untrue, but it lands us in out-and-out dualism, creates an impassable gulf between mind and matter and, by thus making all knowledge impossible, cuts away the very ground from under the feet of Science herself.

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "No ultimate explanation is ever attained by science, proximate explanations only. They are what it exists for. Everything beyond that belongs to another region and must be reached by other methods."

C

We started this chapter with three questions: (1) Are the facts of science objective facts? (2) Are the assertions of Religion mere make-belief? (3) Is the term 'science' to be tied down to the physical sciences?

To (1) we must answer No. Our detailed examination of this first point has been unduly long, but it enables us to answer the other two questions very briefly.

We have seen that the facts of science are not objective facts. The only objective facts we know are our own sensations and thoughts. All our other knowledge is only inferred from these.

Now these thoughts and feelings are either (*a*) the direct outcome of a cause that lies *within* the mind itself, *e.g.*, our feelings of remorse, obligation, aspiration; or (*b*) they are the outcome of a cause that lies *outside* the human mind, *e.g.*, I touch a red-hot iron and feel pain. In (*a*) my feelings and their cause overlap. It is the same 'I' that feels and produces the feelings; so here my knowledge is at first-hand throughout; my facts are objective facts. In (*b*) my feelings and their cause are quite apart. My knowledge of the cause is inferential, second-hand, not an objective fact.

This is why the knowledge of physical science, which deals altogether with (*b*), is inferential and not objective knowledge. The Reality with which science has to do is an external world, an outside Reality.

But there is an internal world, a Reality not outside but inside the human mind. We call it Personality. As we have just seen, this Reality is directly within our ken; our knowledge of it is absolutely at first-hand, and not only *like* what this Reality is in itself, as in science, but *identical* with it. Here my facts are real objective facts. But Personality, or the human heart and mind and will, is precisely the field of Religion. Therefore the facts of Religion, far from being mere make-believe, are objective facts far more real than those of science, Q.E.D.

We can see this readily for ourselves from a more 'common-sense' point of view. Suppose I commit a murder, will you say that the corpse of my victim is real, but my guilty conscience and remorse is not real, only make-believe? Is a cheese real and its smell, but the love of father and son not real? Is a marble statue real, but the ideal of it in the artist's mind, of which it is a mere copy,[1] not real?

[1] It is too plain for words that an artist's creation,—a statue, picture, symphony—never expresses but very imperfectly the conception in the artist's mind, only as much of it as the material subserves.

If I jump into the water to save a drowning man, is my jump into the sea real, but not the sense of duty that prompts the act?

Surely my remorse, my love, my ideals, my sense of duty are not only as real as any external objects, but tenfold more so and more worthy of study, and of scientific study for the matter of that. I emphatically maintain that if the scientist has his mass of facts to deal with, classify and explain, so have I as a spiritual being mine. His are 'natural,' mine moral, facts; his pronouncements are 'judgments of existence,' mine are 'judgments of value.' But I do claim that my facts are every whit as real as his physical facts and as capable of strict scientific statement.[1]

Commonplace terms as they are, let us define judgments of existence and judgments of value, for we shall often use them. Science's pronouncements are 'judgments of existence,' for science is essentially descriptive. Her business is to create in the human mind a picture of things as they exist in Nature. 'What is,' not 'what ought to be,' is her field.

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Although life and mind may be excluded from physiology, they are not excluded from science. It is not reasonable to say that things necessarily elude investigation merely because we do not knock against them. Life is not detected in the laboratory, save in its physical and chemical manifestations, nevertheless it initiates and guides processes."

She tells us the plain fact, "nature *is* red in tooth and claw," and it is no concern of science to square that blunt fact with our ideals.

In so far, science satisfies one part of man's being, his intellect. As a thinking mind I seek truth, or the perfect accord between my thoughts and the reality. Matter-of-fact Science's judgments of existence satisfy my intellect. She lets me see plain facts as they are in the light of cold dry reasoning.

But my intellect is far from the whole of me, only a tiny fraction of me, one-third at the outside. I have a heart and a will as well as an intellect, and they have big claims and wants of their own. As a determining will, I want to be and to do, to express myself in character and action, to live my full life as a whole man, to be what I ought to be and therefore can be. As a feeling heart, I seek the satisfying joy, "the peace of heart passing all understanding," which only comes to him who achieves his true self-expression and fulfils the promise of his life. Intellectual knowledge, or 'judgments of existence,' and the reasoning faculty used for this purpose, do not cover nearly the whole of my experience nor all the faculties of the human mind.[1] Life is far richer than knowledge, and mind is richer than reasoning. Self-

[1] *e.g.*, Emotion and instinct, and intuition and aspiration are immensely older than science, and more real.

realisation is the note of life, and for self-expression man needs motives to influence his will, that is, he wants 'judgments of value.' He must set before himself ends or ideals which he deems good, desirable, obligatory for him.

Now Science knows nothing of these judgments of value. She knows nothing of "ought," she only deals with plain facts as she finds them. True, whenever we have made up our minds what our ends are to be and willed them, science can supply the means to achieve these ends. But she can furnish us neither with the reasons nor motives for pursuing these ends. She knows nothing of aspirations, ideals, duty; and such words as well-being, beauty, obligation are outside her range. She can tell me that many men consider this end or that desirable or good, but she can afford men no convincing reasons for self-surrender or self-sacrifice for good ends. Clearly, then, science does not nearly cover the whole field of life, only one small department of it, and there are dozens of other departments equally important, *e.g.*, ethics, politics, art, culture, religion, philosophy, etc., outside her field. Why should man be satisfied with the little bit of his self-expression which science offers him, when the whole is his? As William James neatly puts it: "To try to satisfy me with the facts of

physical science alone, is something like offering me a printed bill of fare as the equivalent of a solid meal. We use science, but we live by Religion."

Our third and last question was: Is the term 'science' to be tied down to the physical sciences? This question we have already answered in the last pages. If science is above all a knowledge of facts, we have seen that love, remorse, ideals, aspirations, duty and so forth, are facts far more real than the facts of physical science. Therefore there is a psychological department of science dealing with the facts of personality, even as there is a physical department of science dealing with material phenomena. This science of psychology is still in its infancy, and its subject-matter is of a more deep and complex nature than that of physical science. None the less, if physical science sees an ordered whole in the mass of facts with which she deals, a unity of principle beneath the variety of phenomena lying before her eyes in alluring disorder,—so do we in our moral and mental realm. We have as good reason to believe that our world of psychological facts is,—behind all its manifold variety and apparent contradictions,—an ordered cosmos, and it is our business to try and reach it.

CHAPTER V

PERSONALITY IN MAN

A

"WHEN Descartes," writes Schopenhauer, "took his *Cogito, ergo sum*, 'I think, therefore I am,' as alone certain, and provisionally regarded the existence of the world outside him as uncertain, he really discovered the essential and only right starting-point for all philosophy, and at the same time its *true* foundation." This foundation is, essentially and inevitably, the bed-rock fact that my thoughts and feelings are the only real facts I know. All else is inference.

This sums up the essence of our last chapter. Personality is the gateway through which all our knowledge must pass. All knowledge must proceed from the known to the unknown; self is all we really know, so we must start there. "The mind knows best what is nearest to it, and nothing is nearer to the mind than itself," says S. Augustine.

It will be urged:—This makes man the measure of all things in heaven and earth. It is subjectivism run wild, anthropomorphism pure and simple. Logically driven home it leads to solipsism, or the denial by each individual of all reality to anything except himself and his own experience. It also leads to agnosticism, or the assertion that, outside ourselves, we know nothing but phenomena and can never know the reality in or behind them; far less the ground and reason of this reality, our knowledge is so limited and relative. If this is all your Idealist Philosophy has to offer us, we greatly prefer the science you decry. At any rate, science reveals to us an external reality existing independently of any of us and of what we may think of it, while it does not rob us of God.

Such an objection is a caricature of Idealism. Idealism emphatically believes in the reality of an external world as fully as science does, only it spiritualises Nature and sees in it the Thought of God. It also emphatically believes in a Supreme Mind or God as the sole ground and guarantee of all that is and of all knowledge, a Mind of which our mind is a pale copy. Take away any of these three factors—God, man, Nature—and the whole fabric of Idealism falls to pieces.

True, Idealism maintains that neither science, nor

philosophy, nor common-sense can know anything except through Mind and in terms of Mind,—not *my* or *your* individual mind,—but this does not make Idealism either solipsistic or agnostic, just the reverse, as the sequel will show.

As to the charge of anthropomorphism, surely it is too plain for words that all our thought must be anthropomorphic. Science makes man's mind the measure of all things, even as philosophy does. As already seen, the suggestion of Uniformity and Causality in Nature came from what man found within himself. We can go further than this. Scientifically, there are only three ways in which we can view the ultimate or immanent principle of the Universe. We can think of the universe as rationally thought out, that is, as a spiritual system, and construe it in terms of Mind. Or we can think of it as growing like a plant or animal, that is, as a physiological system, and construe it in terms of life. Or we can think of it as a mere machine, and construe it in terms of matter. But where have these three ideas of Mind, life, matter, underlying our three conceptions of it, come from? As Martineau and Lotze tell us, their source springs in each case from our self-experience. It is because we ourselves are rational, that we see reason in the universe; because we are alive, that we believe in its organic life;

because we identify ourselves with our material bodies, that we believe in a material universe. Man's self is equally your point of departure whether as a theist you interpret all in terms of spirit, or as a pantheist in terms of organic life, or as a materialist in terms of matter. The only question is whether you construe the universe by man's highest characteristic, reason; or by his lower attribute which he shares with all organisms, life; or by the lowest of all his attributes, which all physical things share with him, matter.

Science is anthropomorphic throughout, and rightly so. It is unconsciously doing what philosophy does consciously, reading the work of Mind in the light of mind.[1]

As idealists, we are not afraid of anthropomorphising God, for we believe in the essential and eternal unity of God and man. Our mind is God's Mind welling up in us. It is in His light we see light, and all our true thought of God is His own thought of Himself revealed in us. In anthropo-

[1] This is Science's saving clause and explains why "Science presents the singular spectacle of a creed which is believed for one set of reasons (material objects as independent entities), though in theory it can only be justified by another (inferences from our feelings and thoughts), and which, through some beneficent accident, turns out to be true, though its origin and each subsequent stage in its gradual development are the product of error and delusion" (A. J. Balfour).

morphising God we do not make God in our image, but in our image we are on the sure tracks of finding and knowing Him, if we will but take the highest attributes and ideals in ourselves as our clue. It was thus that Christ saw God, revealed Him to man, man to himself, and taught man that what God is, that man was eternally meant to be. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect." "Become what ye are," sons of God.

It was a true instinct that led primitive man to personify Nature's hills and brooks and trees, and it was a true instinct that prompted those religious geniuses, Hebrew prophets, to anthropomorphise God. It was a psychological necessity, as we now see. We do the same to-day, only from a more advanced standpoint. Our knowledge of God has grown with our knowledge of self, and both forms of knowledge have necessarily been simultaneously progressive. In the infancy of the race, man's personality was rude and undeveloped and his knowledge of himself limited and dim. All this was naturally reflected in his knowledge of the external world and of his gods. As his personality and his knowledge of himself developed, higher and truer conceptions of Nature and God simultaneously awoke in him.[1]

Self-knowledge is our God-made road to a know-

[1] Cf. "As the man, so his God."

ledge of Him. This is really what we mean by Revelation. It is the unveiling of man to himself, and therefore of God at the same time. In all revelation, God's share and man's share of activity dovetail indissolubly one into the other; we think our own thoughts, yet, paradoxical as it sounds, it is also God Who is thinking them in us. We may say that revelation is mainly God's work, for it is in His Light that we see light. God wants to impart to us the best of His thoughts as well as the best of His love, for He wants us to be in full communion with Himself. Therefore every moment God's Spirit is trying to get into touch with and influence our spirit. But God honours man's freedom, always deals with him as a free, rational, moral being, and influences him suasively from within his own heart and mind, or not at all.[1] All revelation is therefore subjective, not objective; education, not information. It is not a voice from a supernal heaven, but a voice of God within ourselves; not a communication of a body of truths from without, but a quickening and enlightening process within our own heart. It is the divine in man hearing the voice of God prompting him.

Thus it is emphatically in God's Light that we

[1] Cf. Rev. iii. 20, "I stand at the door and knock," etc., and Rom. viii. 26.

see light, but it is an inner light in ourselves, illuminating the reason, warming the heart, searching the conscience with a fierce search-light. This inner light is the "candle of the Lord, lighted of God and lighting us to God," and its light grows with our own spiritual growth and is conditioned by it.[1] "The pure in heart see God" and hear His voice plainly, while His light all but goes out in a selfish and impure heart, even as a candle's light is killed in a poisoned physical atmosphere. No human heart is without God's presence and revelation, for "His light lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Revelation is not for the few; but some hearts are infinitely more attuned to God than others, and therefore more receptive. What we call progressive revelation is the increasing sense of the presence and influence of the Divine in man. But it is not the light of God that grows, it is our soul's eye and ear that become more open to see His Light and hear His voice in us, as our hearts get more attuned, more receptive of His presence and influence.

[1] "Every change in the tone or temper of experience tends to alter the perspective of all the facts this experience contains. When men rise to a new spiritual level, they will find the whole body of their religious and moral belief suffer change. Every term in their theology will have a new significance, the life of Jesus, the love of God, the meaning of the world, the destiny of man. It is spiritual growth which ultimately determines every theology" (Prof. H. Jones).

We must put aside the picture of God lifting a veil from His own Face, or the idea of His mechanically communicating His Nature and secret counsels to man by some external transaction. God never does that, and Revelation is not that. It is far more the unveiling of man to himself, than of God. It opens man's eyes to see 'the face of his birth,' his 'God-likeness,' his true self. Yet can we say it reveals to us our true self and not God? Assuredly not; the two go together. Pascal seemed to hear God's Voice saying to him: "Thou couldest not seek Me hadst thou not already found Me."[1] How true this is! "'Tis not the voice of God, but thine own heart." True, yet the voice with which my own heart speaks to me and which sounds so like God's Voice *is* God's Voice, for it is He Himself that has prompted my heart so to speak.

In our own heart, then, and nowhere else, does God reveal Himself to us. To know God, look

[1] Cf. Christ: "Seek and ye shall find." Seeking is always finding: *e.g.* no true prayer is unanswered, because all true prayer is addressed to the God Who has Himself prompted it in a heart responsive to His inspiration. Thus the moment I truly seek God, it is He Himself Who has found me and taken possession of me. It is the same all through our spiritual experience. As soon as you repent, you are a righteous man. This is the key to Christ's beatitudes. The poor in spirit *are* rich; the sick *are* whole; the hungry *are* full, etc. These paradoxes are the deepest truths of the life of the soul, and are revealed to babes in Christ, yet hidden from the wordly-wise.

within. Personality is the one gateway through which we pass to the knowledge of God and the answer to the sphinx-riddle of existence.

B

What is Personality? You can describe it, but you cannot define it any more than you can define your simple feelings, for there is nothing simpler than itself into which you can analyse the personal experience you call 'I.' If I wish to convey to another any notion of what my personality is, I can only do so by calling up to his mind's eye something similar in his own experience. My consciousness of what I mean by 'I' is a wholly inward experience personal to myself, inexpressible to others by words or concepts, and nobody can grasp it unless he has undergone it himself, any more than it is possible to explain colour to a man born blind.

And the study of Personality is almost as difficult as its definition. In order to answer the question, "Who and what am I?" I have to perform a very difficult task. I have to set my mind to study itself thinking, feeling, willing. In Kipling's phrase, I have to "go outside myself, and stand beside and watch myself," as if I were a passive spectator taking note of my own thoughts and feelings.

Personality is self-conscious.—This power of self-

introspection enabling a man to stand outside himself, as it were, and watch himself as he thinks and wills and feels, is called self-consciousness. It is the fundamental note of personality or spirit. None but a spiritual being can say 'I am I,' rise above his own petty individuality and make self, as well as the world external to self, the object of its own reflective thought. An animal is not thus self-conscious or capable of reflecting on its own thoughts, feelings, desires. It lives, it feels, it desires, it carries instinct to the very confines of man's reason, but each successive impression, each isolated sensation or desire monopolises its whole being. It never dissociates itself from its feelings, desires, appetites, and knows itself as more than these. The animal passes from one impression to another, from one impulse or gratification to the next, without ever comparing, relating, unifying them together. These animal impulses and appetites are also mine, part and parcel of my nature; but I can watch them, reflect on them, distinguish between myself and these feelings and desires; I can lock all these fleeting sensations tightly together in the unity of thought, arrest, compare, relate them, praise or blame them. Because I can feel and desire, and, at the same time, reflect on my desires and feelings, I am a self-conscious spirit, a person, and an animal is not. For

the same reason I can, if I will, break away from the bondage of my animal appetites, become their master and not their slave, be a law unto myself, a moral being.

Personality is ever one and the same.—Self-introspection soon tells us that two essential notes of what we call our 'self,' 'soul,' 'personality' or *ego*, are its identity and its unity. *Identity.* It is one and the same self that persists through all the changes and chances of my chequered life-experience. When the outward circumstances of my life were far other than they are now; when my face and form were so different that none could recognise in them the myself of to-day; when I had other feelings, other thoughts, other resolves than now; yet, still underlying these differences, there was at the core of me the same self, thinking, feeling, resolving even as to-day. It is this persistent self around which all else in me is gathered. It is this self which takes all my fleeting sensations and binds them all tightly together into the organic whole of my life-experience, and gives that life-experience all its reality, unity and meaning. This is why, even while living most fully in the present, I vividly remember the past and anticipate the future. This is why I look back upon the good deeds of my past as my own good, and its evil experiences leave an

undying remorse as my own evil. My tastes, my habits, my views come and go, my character grows and develops; yet, amid all this variety, my self is the same self that has all along been at the core of my being, my 'immortal centre.'

Unity.—As my reflective mind watches, studies, analyses its own mental states, it discovers what at first glance look like three separate and independent selves,—a thinking self, a willing self, a feeling self. But closer and deeper reflection shows that it is the same 'I' that thinks and wills and feels. The 'I' cannot be identified with either Intellect or Will or Heart, nor is it a mere sum-total or resultant of them all. It is other and larger than them all. These are only its faculties, its organs or channels of self-expression, while the 'I' or soul is the Source of them all, indwelling in them all, embracing them all, yet transcending them all.[1]

Still less, of course, can we identify Personality with the brain. We have already quoted Tyndall's and Huxley's strong protests against the attempt to identify brain-matter and consciousness. The reason why people persist in identifying our *material* brain with our *spiritual* mind is simply because, so long as

[1] Cf. Tyrrell: "The meaning of the pronoun 'I' is the mystery of mysteries. We are immeasurably more than we can ever comprehend."

we are in the prison of this body, our mind-development is conditioned by the growth of its organ the brain, its physical vehicle of expression. In itself, our brain can no more think than a telegraph-wire can convey a message without the electric current. Our brain is the wire and can do nothing without the mind's vital spark. True, brain and mind do seem to develop side by side, there is a psycho-physical parallelism between the two, but, as Tyndall and Huxley saw, this is quite a different thing from saying that our brain-cells *are* our mind. Man is now soul + body, but a material body is no essential part of our true self. "Consciousness without brain-action is perfectly conceivable," writes Tyndall; Kant adds: "And on earth our entire personality is never manifest." To quote M'Taggart's apt illustration: "If a man is shut up in a house, the transparency of the windows is an essential condition of his seeing the sky. But it would not be prudent to infer that, if he walked out of the house, he could not see the sky because there was no longer any glass through which he might see it."

Thus our 'I' thinks, wills, feels, and uses a material brain as its organ; yet it is not identical with either Intellect, Will, Heart, or brain. It underlies, quickens, unifies them all, yet transcends them all. They are members of the organic whole

of which it is the source and goal, the key and vital principle. My faculties are its creation; it is not theirs, though they are the means of its self-expression.

As to the character and action of this self, we may roughly describe it somewhat as follows:—

> "There is an immortal centre in us all,
> Where truth abides in fulness,
> All round, wall upon wall, the gross flesh hems it in."

There, at the core of our being, sits our true self steering the course of our life-experience, like a helmsman with his hand ever on the tiller. It keeps the log of our life-experience, the reading of which is the biography of our individual lives. It binds tightly together into one living organic whole the many experiences of our life, outward and inward, moral and intellectual, spiritual and physical, past and present. Around it all else of ours is gathered and, but for it, all else in our experience would be stripped of its significance and cease to be with the moment that gave it birth and saw it die. Self makes man stand for *permanent* interests. Amid the flux of things it is the one thing fixed, an immovable focus, the nucleus of our being, the fixed rock in the stream of life on which we stand and note all else as it flows past us. As Mansel says: "That which I see, that which I hear,

that which I think, that which I feel, changes and passes away with each moment of my varied existence. I, who see and hear and think and feel, am the continuous self whose existence gives unity and connexion to the whole."

Personality's faculties.—Amid the attributes of personality, three stand out prominently in every man's experience: it thinks, it wills, it feels; or, as we commonly say, it has three organs of self-expression, Mind + Will + Heart. For *practical* purposes of investigation we may keep them apart, and we can do so in thought, but we must beware of falling into the common error of supposing that our mind and will and heart are like so many water-tight compartments of our Personality. As a matter of fact, you might as well try and dissociate the Sun's light and heat. So completely do thought and desire and feeling radiate from one and the same self, which indwells in and correlates and unifies them all, that you *never* find one without the other two. All our thoughts, all our desires, all our emotions emanate from one Personality which simultaneously thinks and wills and feels. It is so essentially one in itself, that it relates and blends them all into its own oneness and links them indissolubly one with another.

"I cannot think without attention, and attention

is an act of *will*, involving also a *desire* to attend. I cannot desire without *thinking* of what I desire, and *willing* to attain the object of my desire or to abstain from it. I cannot will without *thinking* of an object or purpose and *desiring* its realisation." In a word, our thoughts are the thoughts of a being that loves and wills; our will, of a being that loves and thinks; our love, of a being that thinks and wills; therefore our thoughts, will, emotions all blend together, for the simple reason that one and the same living energy or soul is their quickening and unifying source. To say 'I am a personality' is to say I, a spirit or person, am an organic whole, am heart + mind + will. If you deprive me of any one of these, or make them independent of each other, or exalt one above the other, you proportionately mar or stunt me as a whole man.

Personality *is* the whole man, claims the whole of man, and refuses to attach itself to one faculty, be it will or intelligence or feeling. That personality alone which claims and uses the whole man is an explicit personality, perfectly proportioned and in full inner harmony with itself. A personality which only satisfies will and feeling, but stunts the intellect; or which satisfies the intellect, but paralyses the will and starves the feelings, can only be called an undeveloped personality, a 'personality by courtesy.' It is lop-

sided and immature. Nine-tenths of us are personalities of this nature. We sacrifice our full self-expression to the practical considerations of life, and specialise even in character so as to be more effective in our pet line. Thus we say of one man 'he is all heart,' because he seeks to dominate his life and character through the affections. That is *his* ideal of personality, and so he subordinates thought and will to heart. Another man makes conduct and action three-fourths of life. That is *his* ideal, so he makes will supreme. A third regards life as raised to its highest power through the intellect, and devotes himself to that. A perfectly proportioned personality is as rare as a perfectly proportioned body, indeed far rarer. And we all claim that *our* ideal of personality is the right one. Thus one man makes feeling, another considers thought, the pivot of religion, and each credits the other with a false or defective psychology. So long as our temperaments are differently constituted this is inevitable, for a man can only see what he brings eyes to see; and with our human nature as it now is, we want all three types of mind, just as we want Conservatives and Liberals.[1] They supplement and complement each other, except when the spirit of the age unduly

[1] *i.e.* minds biased to question tradition or authority and minds biased to uphold it. Both types are needed for Truth. One is

favours one type; for there are fashions in views as well as in dress, and just now Pragmatism is run for far more than it is worth.

So completely does personality claim the whole man, that we dare not suppress even what we call our animal appetites and desires. The attempt of the ascetic to do so is bound to prove either abortive or morally suicidal. These appetites are the stuff or raw material out of which our moral life springs. It could not be without them, for the moral life is not a passionless life. The perfect man takes these lower appetites and desires, but in making them his own he does not leave them as he found them. In making them part and parcel of his own higher organic unity or self, he infuses all the virtue of reason and will and heart inherent in his soul into these dull and blind natural desires, transfigures them into valuable food for his own spiritual life, even as the soul of a plant transmutes into flower and fruit the very foulness of the soil whence it springs.

Personality's 'categorical imperative.'—Our soul is an essentially practical soul. It wants to live its full life and have scope for its full self-expression.

God's witness against slothful acquiescence in received views, the other is God's protest against the tendency to catch at the new because it is new.

Self-realisation is its definite end, its ideal. It knows it is not, in man, what it can be and ought to be, and it means to be that.

In man there is the same Directivity spurring him on to strain after his ideal perfection that we have already noted in plants and animals (Chap. II. § *C.*). We have seen that there was a creative directive consciousness even in the amœba, which would give it no rest till it had evolved into man. "Man, from the beginning of organisms, was present as an ideal upon earth." But there is this huge difference between the Directivity of man and that of lower organisms. They neither know nor will the ideal perfection which is their goal. It is not consciously present to them. The law of its being is written in the heart of a plant or animal, the Universal Consciousness welling up in their consciousness has written it there,—this is what we mean by soul-directivity,—and plants and animals obey that law implicitly, but in a purely instinctive and unconscious way. Theirs is an unimpeded progress, as evolution shows, but a perfectly unconscious progress towards an unknown goal to which they never give a thought. With self-conscious man,—just because he is self-conscious,—the whole case is different. He both knows and wills his ideals, even when he sets up false ones. His soul-directivity ever prompts him

onward and upward, and he knows it, and tries to co-operate with it, even when he blunders most in the attempt by reason of his mistaking the ideal of his lower self for the ideal of his higher self.

From the very dawn of self-consciousness in man,—the moment of all moments when the First Man emerged from apedom,—man has been awake to the fact that he is other and greater than his appetites and passions and their temporary gratification. From that moment it has dawned upon him little by little that he has the making of himself in his own hands. More and more, as the eye of his soul gains greater sight and his self-consciousness develops, his eyes have become opened to the law of his being, and the Directivity of his soul is for him a self-directivity in a very real sense. His possibilities he means to convert into actualities.

In a word, self-conscious man has a practical ideal which he keeps steadily in view and means to achieve. As a thinking mind, he seeks truth; as a determining will, he seeks his own self-realisation; as a feeling heart, he seeks the satisfaction which comes only to him who achieves his full self-expression and realises the promise of his being. Self-conscious, he is alive to the fact that all truth is knowable as *his* truth, all goodness as *his* good-

ness, if he will but to himself be true and rise to the fulness of his stature.

This ideal of self-realisation presents itself to man's soul as a categorical imperative, a duty to be done. His soul speaks to him with a voice of command, thrusts upon him deeds to do or not to do which are foreign to the 'natural' man, alien to his animal-appetite nature. His true self imperatively directs his mind to rest in nothing short of absolute truth, and prompts his will to express itself in "whatever deeds are good, honest, just, lovely and of good report." And only as his mind and will hear this voice, and obey it freely and implicitly, is his heart at peace and satisfied. "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless till it find its rest in Thee."

Personality's unrest.—Ideal and reality, 'is' and 'ought to be,' are two totally distinct things. Each time my soul reviews its past and present, contrasts my character as it is with the ideal personality after which my true self is straining, it contemns and condemns its present self-expression. Hence the soul's unrest.

This self-dissatisfaction is part and parcel of every human heart. This 'soul-hunger,' this 'wasting fever of the heart,' prompting the soul to find rest in this or that earthly good which fails to satisfy

it,—attracted the attention of ancient thinkers, and is with us now. In our attempt to satisfy this soul-hunger, we do as the Preacher of old and "give our heart to know wisdom and to know madness and folly," and lo! it is all vanity; for the source and secret of our unrest is the instinctive yearning of my soul to be at one with the Father-Soul which is its source and life and light. "My soul is athirst for God, yea even for the living God," is the desire of desires innate in every human heart, be he saint or sinner. Whoever and whatever we may be, saints or sinners, we are soul-hungry. The saint is pained at his inability to express his true will: "the good that I would, I do not"; while the conscious sinner is dissatisfied with the very will he is at the moment expressing: "I said of laughter, It is mad; and of mirth, What doeth it? All is vanity and vexation of spirit."

Conscious of its ideal, its immense possibilities, and painfully aware of its puny actuality, our soul is an hungered, thirsty, naked, in need in us all. "Why art thou so restless, O my soul, and why art thou so disquieted within me?" It is restless and disquieted, not so much with morbid feelings, as with a divine discontent protesting against all endeavours to crush the noblest of its aspirations. It sees us at war with ourselves, trying to serve two

masters simultaneously, hugging and hating our lower appetites and desires at the same moment. It calls upon us to 'come to ourselves,' to identify ourselves with the ideal of a higher nature which dwarfs all our present knowledge and goodness. 'Become, what you are!'[1]

Thank God for this soul-hunger! It is the purest and best desire we can feel and the healthiest. For what does this restlessness mean? It means that the true self at the core of my being is aware of tendencies, appetites, ideas within its own field, which it knows to be fatal to its own best life. It knows these desires, feelings, fancies to be part and parcel of itself, yet rejects, abhors them, as they are now, as excrescences alien to itself which must be either mastered or transmuted. This Jekyll and Hyde dual personality within itself shocks the soul, and it is precisely the inner strain and strife of these two selves, which are one self, that creates the soul's unrest. For these two combatants are not two, but one. Fly apart they cannot; they are locked up in one and the same consciousness. Hence the torture of a soul divided against itself, the keen sense of remorse which oppresses the true self saddled with the guilt of its lower self, the agony of a moral

[1] Cf. Paul: "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk" (R.V.).

struggle where the same 'I' is "at once the combatants and the conflict and the field that is torn with the strife."

Yet this vivid sense of self-dissatisfaction points, not merely to the possibility, but the practical certainty of a cure. It must end in the conquest of the alien element and its conversion into a servant, thus begetting inner harmony. Christ is right. All spiritual seeking is finding, for it is a divinely inspired quest after at-oneness with a God Who has already entered our heart and is Himself prompting our quest. "Thou wouldest not seek Me, hadst thou not already found Me." "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Our soul-unrest is the truest symptom of health.[1] The very first pulsation of self-dissatisfaction and aspiration shows that our ideal has already become our real, that our finite is speeding to its goal and is already here and now suffused with the presence and life of the Infinite. The soul-hungry *are* fed, the poor in spirit *are* rich. From the moment of our spiritual unrest, the far-off

[1] All pain, physical or moral, is a symptom of health. It is the reaction of vitality and health against the decay and disease invading the territory of the organic whole. Pain is the symptom of evil, sickness, division, yet a sure sign that the living energy and vitality of the soul is also actively present to conquer the evil and restore perfect harmony and health. It is only the painlessness of paralysis that spells certain death.

vision of spiritual attainment is already a present reality. "The Kingdom of God is within you." You have put off the old man and put on the new, and the whole future of the religious life is virtually given in its very beginning and birth in the soul. You are already in possession of your eternal inheritance, if you will but 'endure to the end' by the constant exercise of the spiritual activity that is now yours. The hidden riches and all-subduing power of your soul-life will unfold ever more and more, but the heavenly life is yours already here and now. 'It is no longer I that live, but God that liveth in me."

Personality's freedom of will.—A categorical imperative which imposes commands upon us, and thrusts upon us duties which we cannot shirk, involves freedom of will. 'Ought' is a meaningless term to me unless what I ought to do or be lies within my own power, *i.e.* unless I have a will of my own.

This problem of the freedom of the will is the deepest and hardest of all problems and must have a chapter to itself, which we would fain shirk.

Personality's subconscious mind.—Ever since Myers wrote his *Human Personality*, the word subconscious or subliminal ('below the threshold') is familiar to us all, as applied to mental processes constantly

taking place below the threshold of our normal consciousness. Myers' work cannot be said to mark the actual discovery of anything fundamentally new, but his and subsequent investigations into the workings of our subconscious mind represent the most important advance in the field of experimental psychology within recent times. Leibnitz was probably the first to call attention to our subconscious self, a mysterious department of our personality revealing to us a far wider field of consciousness than our ordinary conscious self would lead us to suspect. As J. P. Richter writes: "We attribute far too small dimensions to the rich empire of our Self, if we omit from it the unconscious region which resembles a great dark continent. The world which our memory peoples only reveals in its revolution a few luminous points at a time, while its immense and teeming mass remains in shade. We daily see the conscious passing into unconsciousness, and take no notice of the bass accompaniment which our fingers continue to play, while our attention is directed to fresh musical effects."

Of course, the investigations into this mysterious region are still in too early and raw a stage to give us any very definite results, and the Columbus of this new continent will not come for many a day. But it already seems safe to assume that the working

intelligence which we consciously exercise is inspired and fed from a vast reservoir of recorded thought and experience which has passed into oblivion, so far as the surface-mind is ordinarily concerned. The surface-mind forgets much, the subliminal mind forgets nothing. We constantly find that we have not in reality forgotten things which have seemed clean obliterated from our minds. A spring is touched by a chance hand or circumstance, and instantly there is an upward spray of the fountains of unconscious memory. We see, as clearly as if it were before us, a face forgotten for years, or we take part in some episode of our childhood and re-live it as vividly as if we were once more engaged in it.

Moreover, our subconscious self would seem to have faithfully registered, not merely every single incident in our experience since our identity began, but the quintessence of the experience of our ancestors, both animal and human, for countless generations.

This modern view of our subconscious self as a larger and permanent personality, of which the conscious self is only a fraction in process of individualisation,—even if it be at present only a working hypothesis,—illuminates many obscure facts. It accounts for the extraordinary rapidity with

which the mental development of an individual proceeds to-day. It elucidates such unusual experiences as those commonly associated with, *e.g.*, sudden conversions, dreams, telepathy, dual personality, premonitions, auto-suggestion, faith-healing, inspirations of genius,[1] and so forth. It seems probable that genius is an abnormal power to draw upon this hidden store; and intuitions reach us from the same deep source, as the outcome of some subconsciously recorded experience which has escaped the record of the conscious mind.

Although our conscious intelligence is not able to draw from this subconscious reservoir at will, we are doing it everyday far more than we fancy. Our auto-suggestions of fear, hope or health are seeds planted in this rich soil which soon bear fruit after their kind. Moreover, our unconscious cerebrations, often reaching elaborate results such as our conscious intelligence seldom achieves, prove the wealth of the treasure lying within us, if we but knew how to spade down into our own depths and make use of that rich vein.

But our knowledge of the subliminal mind and its

[1] Cf. Oliver Lodge: "the subliminal self—a larger and dominant entity, belonging to us in some sense, or rather to which we belong, . . . an accumulation of powers and insight, of which the ordinary uninspired man is unaware, but to which the genius has moments of access."

mechanism is still very limited, and we must beware of premature generalisations on insufficient data. No doubt, our submerged personality is larger and richer than our conscious self. It may possibly also be in touch with a world inaccessible to our ordinary self. But surely it is a premature assumption, unwarranted by the evidence at our disposal, to assert with Myers and W. James and Oliver Lodge, that through our subconscious self we are in touch with the spiritual world and with the Source of all life. It may be so ; but, on our present knowledge, scientists are right to retort to such suggestions :—Our subconscious self is only the record of our past experience and that of the race ; your supernatural ideas of it are nothing but the discovery of a mare's nest.

To sum up. Man's Personality is ever one and the same, creative, self-conscious and self-directing. Our heart and mind and will are the soul's faculties or channels of self-expression, and, as proceeding from one and the same soul, you never find them apart. Our personality has an ideal which it presents to us as a categorical imperative. This ideal is ever with us and shows us 'the face of our birth,' the self God means us to be. Thus it makes us dissatisfied with what we actually are, and creates

the soul-hunger or unrest we all feel. Man, if he is to obey the soul's categorical imperative and achieve its ideal, must have freedom of will. He must be able to be and to do what he knows he ought to do and to be. Besides our conscious self, we also have a larger self which we call our subconscious or our subliminal mind.

CHAPTER VI

THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL

EVERY form of human activity involves three factors: (1) I must set before me an end to be achieved; my heart-desires instinctively suggest this end. (2) I must discover ways and means to attain this suggested end; my intelligence suggests them. (3) I have to sit in judgment on the end suggested, weigh its pros and cons, give the casting-vote and verdict, say 'Yes' or 'No' to it, and, according to my verdict, issue orders to set the machinery in motion so as to realise this end or abstain from it. This is the work of my will.[1]

Over this question of the verdict of the will there rages a battle royal between two rival schools of thought. The advocates of Free-Will insist that

[1] As already seen, all three faculties (heart, mind, will) are involved in each of these three stages, but (1) = *mainly* heart, (2) = reasoning, (3) = will. Really, reasoning plays no very large part in the determination of our ends. Our emotional preferences are the dominant factor. Our feelings make our ends shine before us, and supply largely the will-motives which drive us towards our 'end' as with the hidden power of a propeller; reasoning merely

the will is free to choose whether it shall say Yes or No to any end we may have in view. Determinists, on the other hand, maintain that the will is not thus free to choose, but is itself biased and determined by conditions outside its control.—To weigh the respective claims of these two schools is the long, hard and dry task before us. This chapter is merely an attempt to present the case of Free-Will in such a light as to bring it into line with the main principle for which these pages stand. Apart from this, and a few suggestive thoughts, there is little that is very new in its matter.

It may be well to define at the outset what believers in Free-Will mean by freedom of will. Even in the Free-Will camp there are two wings, the extremists and the moderates. The out-and-out Free-Will school give us a caricature of Free-Will which makes the will a colourless blank. They imagine that, at any given moment, I am free to choose any one of a dozen different motives each prompting me to a different course of action, so

adding the specious strokes of the oar which *seemingly* impels us onward. Even when we are most rational in our choices, our emotional preferences act as currents gently furthering or steadily hemming our progress towards the goal. But, though *reasoning* plays no large part here, we shall see that *reason* plays a very large part in willing, and has the last word, so that we can go in the very teeth of impulse and desire, and refuse to do what it prompts.

that whenever I do anything good or bad I might just as readily have done the reverse. This would mean that the will is a kind of empty colourless faculty, capable of choosing A or B or C or D indifferently, then emptying itself again after any choice on its part has actualised and once more becoming the colourless blank it was before.

At that rate, we cannot speak of persons as good or bad except at the moment that they are choosing good or bad courses of action. For instance, according to this superficial and absurd parody of Free-Will, David is good before his fall, bad during it, and his will is neither good nor bad immediately after, till it makes another choice which, for the time being, again gives it a good or bad colour according to its own complexion. It is only at the moment of choosing badly that David is bad, and, even at that instant, while choosing to fall, he might equally have chosen to stand, and, the moment after his fall, his will is again perfectly free and competent to choose the best of actions.

Such an idea of freedom is the empty dream of a man who has parted with his reason. It is a psychological impossibility for the human will ever to be such a colourless blank, and for this reason. Whenever we think of freedom of will, it must be somebody's free-will, and that somebody has a

nature or character of his own which colours his will. Freedom of will in real life is self-determination or self-expression according to the definite character of the actual individual. For example, most people will readily admit that God's will is free, yet He is not free to choose good or bad motives indifferently, as this indeterminate theory of Free-Will maintains. He can do or not do anything and everything He wills to do or not to do, but God can only will as His true and good character directs Him to will. There are some choices and actions impossible to God, or He would cease to be God. He cannot possibly will anything immoral or contradictory to His character as God. Freedom is a totally different thing from arbitrariness or caprice.

So it is with each one of us. We are none of us without a definite character of our own, and that character determines our will at any given moment, or, at any rate, gives it a pronounced bias in the direction which the character favours. As George Eliot says: "We prepare ourselves for sudden deeds by the reiterated choice of good or evil that gradually determines character." Every single one of my past choices has registered itself in me and given me a tendency or bias to develop in a particular direction. This bias or predisposition to a certain course of conduct is what I call my

character, and it strongly colours and influences my will. It is true that, however strongly this bias may press me in its own direction, I *can* counteract it[1] and go in the teeth of its impulse; but the moral certainty is that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred I shall have no wish or intention to do so. Almost without exception, character takes the reins out of my hands and determines my will.

So we see that David's adultery was not the sudden freak of a blank will that usually (but accidentally) made equally freakish, yet good choices. It was not a choice to fall when he might just as easily have chosen to stand. It was not an unaccountable blot in the hitherto snow-white page of his pure life. If such a thing were possible, life would be a series of non-moral disconnected acts, each monopolising us for the moment, then vanishing tracelessly to give place to its successor. At that rate, personality would be an absolutely meaningless word. Such a conception of will is untenable, because psychologically impossible. David had long been "preparing himself for this sudden deed by the reiterated choice" of lustful deeds, and the

[1] This seems to fly straight in the face of 'character determines will' of the previous paragraph, yet it does not directly contradict it, as the sequel will show. The accent has to be laid on *I* and its soul-directivity with all it involves. *There* lies the clue to our freedom.

harbouring of lustful thoughts, which registered themselves in and gradually determined his character. At the moment of his fall, his character determined his will, and, with that character as it was, he could hardly help his choice. We shall see that he could have chosen otherwise, but it was a moral certainty that he would choose as he did.

Thus in a sense the believer in Free-Will is also a Determinist, exactly as a believer in the soul's creative Directivity also admits the immense influence of environment in organic evolution. In Chap. II. § *C.*, we saw that the bodily form of plants and animals is the self-expression of a creative soul within which determines what form that body is to assume, but we saw, too, that *indirectly* external conditions had also a voice in the matter. That is to say, even in the creation of our bodies the creative soul is self-determining and yet determined.

So it is with our soul-faculties. In each one of us there is an eternally complete God-consciousness which is ever seeking for its own perfect expression in us. But it is tied down, in the human body, to an imperfect animal-organism for its vehicle of expression. It has to use the body and its faculties,—its own creations,—as the instrument of its manifestation in us, and this it can only do as the body and its faculties develop sufficiently to

become its proper vehicle. For our faculties grow even as our bodies grow. Even Jesus "increased in wisdom, as well as in stature and in favour with God and man"; even He "learned obedience by the things He suffered," *i.e.* His mind and will went through the same process of development as ours. But both in Him and in us, the soul within, the creative directive self which is our real 'I,' is complete from the outset. "What we call our mental history," says T. H. Green, "is not a history of this eternal consciousness,—*it has no history*,—but a history of the process by which the animal-organism becomes its vehicle."

Now in dealing with Free-Will, it is this eternally complete consciousness, welling up in us and sprung from God, with which we have ultimately to reckon, for it always has the last word. We can readily see this from what was said of Human Personality in Chapter V. As we saw there, we are ever conscious of two personalities within us: one as actually expressed in our present character, the other as the perfect and implicit personality—with its ideal, and its categorical imperative—after which we are straining. Paradoxical as it sounds, this ideal personality is ours already here and now, and makes its presence felt and known in our 'soul-hunger' and sense of 'ought.' "The Kingdom

of God *is* within you." This ideal self's creative, directing, inspiring *élan* sets before us a standard of excellence which dwarfs all we have hitherto achieved, yet makes us confident that there is no limit to the knowledge and goodness to which we may aspire and must attain. It is precisely here that comes the parting of the ways between Determinists and believers in Free-Will. Both agree that *character determines will*, but by character Determinists mean 'my present character,' while Free-Will advocates say: No! not 'my present character,' but 'the character of my true self' ultimately determines my will. Were it not for the presence in man, here and now, of this true self and its high ideal, a self as free and creative and self-determining as the God-Self whence it springs, man never could modify his acquired character, rise above what his actual present character and environment determined him to be, and be converted; and conversion is a fact.

The believer in Free-Will readily admits that in nine cases out of ten our actual present character determines will. But he emphatically insists that however strong may be the influence and bias of my present character on my will, I can assert the freedom of my true self and refuse to do what it prompts, and in so doing modify my present

character; *i.e.* my present character is something plastic which my God-Self can mould at will.

This fully explains, to our mind, the personal conviction inherent in every man's consciousness that he is a free agent. As H. Sidgwick says: "The cumulative argument for Determinism is almost overwhelming, yet this seems more than balanced by a single argument on the other side: the immediate affirmation of consciousness in the moment of deliberate volition. No amount of experience of the sway of motives even tends to make me distrust my intuitive consciousness that in resolving after deliberation I exercise free choice as to which of the motives acting upon me shall prevail." Martineau says the same thing: "No man can sincerely deem himself by nature incapable of controlling his impulses and modifying his acquired character. The mere fact that we are able to examine, compare, weigh these impulses, places us in a judicial and authoritative attitude towards them, and would have no meaning if we were not there to decide what influence they should have. The casting-vote and verdict upon the offered motives lies with us, not with themselves. . . . We are not the theatre, they the agents; we are the agents, and they the data of the problems we solve."

Take the case of David again by way of illustration. On the eve of his fall he is a sensualist, and his fall is the self-expression of this character. But there is also in him at that very moment a higher self he cannot altogether away with, and it will have the last word, sooner or later. David's is such a typical case that it is well worth analysing in detail.

As a sensualist giving expression to his character of the time being, he is absorbed in the gratification of his animal appetites and, as we often say, on a level with the brutes. This last remark is not true. He cannot be a mere brute with appetites of a neutral moral tint, for he is a *rational* animal, and this 'reason' enables him to rise above or sink below brutes, but never to be level with them. Why? Because his appetites can now manufacture an ideal for him and set it up before him as an end to live up to. How, you ask, can appetites have an ideal; they are blind passions, satisfied with the gratification of the moment, and never look ahead of their immediate gratification? True, in browsing cattle, but not in rational man. As a self-conscious thinking animal, man knows and thinks his animal-appetites, and to know and think them is to make them more than appetites. It robs them of all their blindness and simplicity;

they are no longer blind, but seeing. Armed with reason they have now enlisted into their service, in their strife with the higher principle in man, a powerful force which they have stolen from the higher principle itself with which they are at war. This is why the sensualist, as a rational sensualist, can give a permanent value and reality to his sensuous gratifications as an animal cannot. He can identify himself with them, recall and reflect on them, anticipate and plan them, set them up as rational ideals or ends in life capable of absorbing his whole being, of rivalling and ousting the higher ideals or ends of his true self.

This was precisely David's case. He chooses adultery with Bathsheba because, a sensualist in character, possession of her realises the idea of self-gratification which his appetites have set before him as his life-ideal. For the time being, this false ideal of his animal-nature is all-absorbing and ousts the true ideal of his real self.

Can such a man ever 'come to himself'? Will not his present bad character, like a rolling snow-ball, go on taking unto itself new elements after its own kind and go from bad to worse? Probably, but not necessarily. However low David, you or I may fall, we have a *real* power of resisting our present bad character and refusing to do as it

prompts. We are not its slave, though neither are we in such a sense its master that we can at once compel it to desist from its urgent solicitations. In David and us all, tamper with it as we will, there is still a true self left with its high ideal and a never-silenced categorical imperative. This true self is ever other and larger and stronger than the character of the moment, and has the knack of reasserting itself in a wondrous way, breaking like withes the fetters in which our bad habits have bound it hand and foot, and thus in a measure regaining its freedom. Conversion proves it.

Truth, love, goodness are the ideals of this true self, its life-breath. Falsehood, hate, wrong acts contradict its very essence and clog, limit, fetter its innate creative self-directivity. If I identify myself with my true self and make its ideals my own, its creative self-directivity or freedom finds full scope and becomes my very own. In its service I find my own perfect freedom. Even while saying, "Thy will, not mine, be done," I am really giving expression to my true will. On the other hand, if I persist in giving false emphasis and undue influence to what contradicts my true self's ideals, if I deliberately fly in the face of its promptings and its categorical imperative, I clog its freedom-scope and with it my own. Wrong acts and choices fix wrong

habits, and these increasingly limit the soul's freedom, which is *there*, but clogged. Should my persistent self-absorption in the false ideals of my lower self blind me to the ideals of my true self, my chance of recovery is infinitesimal. The accusing voice of my real self once silenced, there would be no feeling of unrest, no self-dissatisfaction, no soul-hunger. My present would quite satisfy and absorb me, and there would be no call to spur me on to higher aspirations. Thank God! seldom if ever is the true self or its voice thus eclipsed. It has a wondrous knack of reasserting itself and snapping its fetters asunder as the "twice-born" know.

No one has ever read human nature as truly as Christ. He knew, what we constantly overlook, that, hide as we will the God-Self within us under the bushel of our lower nature, the divine spark is there all the same ever ready to he fanned into a flame. Beneath the rust and grime of their actual characters, He saw potential angels in the worst of men, and just because He appealed to the God-soul in them and demanded high achievements of the most unlikely, His soul was constantly gladdened by a wondrous response.

This gives us the key to all conversion, be it David's, Paul's, or our own. Nathan's parable was the occasion, not the cause, of David's conversion.

Probably, like Paul's, it was not the sudden, abrupt, unheralded conversion David or we fancy. Clogged and fettered and all but smothered by the flesh David's personality may have been, but it was far from killed or even silenced. Nathan's parable of the poor man's ewe-lamb was but the consummation of a long series of its pricks and goadings in David's subconscious self. If the flax had not been smoking, even God could not have fanned it into a flame. Subconsciously, the true self within David's heart had for some time been holding parley with the God knocking at that heart-door. With Nathan's appeal he 'came to himself,' and in the light of his true self he now faces his appetites and their false ideal from a totally different standpoint and sees that all their values are wrong.[1] He does not become a passionless saint, but his centre of gravity is altogether changed. Before his conversion, his lower self supplied his ideal, now his real self does it. The animal-appetites and desires are still there, but transfigured by the presence and power of a new and higher principle. The evil of his old man is

[1] As the Prodigal Son shows, all true conversion is ever a 'coming to oneself,' a recognition by man of a Love to which he was blind, and of a sonship he neither prized nor realised. His Father's love puts him to shame, yet at the same time forgives, and the forgiveness acquires a new tenderness and fulness through the sense of the wrong done to love so great.

still with him. Even a converted David cannot compel long-indulged appetites at once to desist from their urgent solicitations. But they are already virtually dead, for he has now cut off the supplies which feed their life. Self-gratification is now present as something which does not really belong to him, something alien and repugnant to his true self with which in his inmost spirit he has now identified himself. More and more will he be able to say: "Evil comes and finds nothing in me," now that there is a principle at work which spells death to his old sins. So does David the adulterer and murderer become "the man after God's own heart."

Thus, just because the Free-Will advocate is also a Determinist, and regards character as the determining motive of the will's action at any given moment, does he also emphatically insist on the freedom of the will. The point at issue between the two schools all turns on the definition of character. The Determinist says: Character is my character as it actually is at present. The Indeterminist replies: A man's character is this and something more, for you have left out the dominant factor, soul-directivity.

. . . . . .

Strictly speaking, we should have stated the case for determinism first, but the previous pages will

enable us to discuss it better here. Determinists certainly hold a strong brief and, as H. Sidgwick says, "the cumulative argument for it is almost overwhelming at first sight." Their plea is that, all over the universe, the law of causality holds good invariably, and surely it must be the same in the case of mind. Our character and actions are regulated by forces which work as uniformly as those which determine the motions of the planets, the growth of crops, or the fall of rain. Statistics prove that although man as a single individual is an enigma, man as a collective whole is a constant factor, and his actions are strictly determined for him and capable of exact prediction. The full realisation of this fact may elude the investigator for two main reasons: (1) we all more or less share the popular illusion that we act as we like; (2) the realm of mind is far more complex and hard to analyse than the physical realm. But, all appearances notwithstanding, the law of causality is of universal application, and there can be no shadow of a doubt that there is no event in the spiritual life which does not obey immutable laws. Our will, erratic as it may seem, is as determined as anything in the inorganic world. We have not power of observation sufficient to discover the manifold and often minute factors, acquired or inherited, which

determine our will, any more than we can say why a particular drop of rain falls here and not a yard off, yet the exact spot is determined on which the drop is to fall. Similarly, it is determined for a man what motives shall be present to him at any given moment and which of these motives he will choose. To believe otherwise and deny, as do Free-Will advocates, the application of the law of causality to the human will, is to make morality precarious and character an impossibility, reducing all to chance and chaos.

This certainly sounds like good logic; so do the Determinist's ready answers to all the stock-arguments in favour of indeterminism or Free-Will. These arguments are somewhat as follows:—

(*a*) *I am immediately certain that my will is free. I know it intuitively.—Answer.* Are our so-called intuitive convictions really intuitive and immediate?[1] We may not be conscious of any process of reflection in arriving at them and may regard them as pure intuitions, but may they not be either (1) the result of unconscious or subconscious reflection; or

[1] Determinists, of course, recognise some immediate intuitions. There must be, if we are to have any knowledge at all; for all knowledge proceeds from the known to the unknown, and we must start with something which is not itself an inference. But these immediate convictions are simple, and not of the complex nature of the dogma of Free-Will.

(2) registered ancestral experience, like instinct; or (3) unwarrantable assumptions, the outcome of long association and habit? Even if we accept many beliefs as intuitional, this is no test of their truth. The belief in the independent existence of matter is usually called intuitional, yet it is a gratuitous hypothesis. The many diversified and mutually contradictory beliefs of different religious creeds are ranked by their votaries as intuitions, yet how can they contradict each other and all be true?

(*b*) *When I will a thing, I feel I could will the opposite if I chose.—Answer.* So do I, says the Determinist; but a feeling of freedom is a vague and relative term. If I walk out of my front door, I experience no such feeling of constraint as I do when I am forcibly taken by the scruff of the neck and thrust out of the house. But this feeling of freedom does not mean that my will is not determined for me when I walk out of the house of my own accord. It only means that when causes *within myself* determine me to a certain course of action, I identify myself with them and feel no sense of compulsion, while I do feel it when the same action is due to causes *outside myself.* In reality, my action is equally determined in either case.

(*c*) *The sense of moral obligation to will right argues freedom of will.—Answer.* Not at all! says

the Determinist. I also feel a sense of obligation and yet know my will is determined for me. Equally with the Indeterminist, I condemn my character if it tends to produce evil results, but this condemnation of my character by myself and others is precisely one of the factors determining my will. This condemnation is a painful experience to me, whether it comes in the form of a whipping, or remorse, or the lash of public opinion. Now I hate pain and love pleasant experiences. The expectation of pleasure or pain I therefore reckon, and must reckon, among the conditions which affect my character. They are motives determining the will and creating in man a sense of obligation to act otherwise than he would have acted if left to himself.

(*d*) *Free-Will must be true, for its opposite is absurd and incredible.—Answer.* Determinism must be true, for its opposite flies in the face of the universal law of causation, which is absurd and incredible.

(*e*) *Free-Will must be true, for disastrous consequences would otherwise follow.—Answer.* This is an appeal to the gallery. Things are what they are, whether we like them or not. Our idea of their moral value or otherwise has intrinsically nothing whatever to do with the matter. We do not disbelieve in a good God because of the bad results we choose to discover in the pain and evil which seem to mar His world.

This argument on utilitarian or moral grounds is worthless, *e.g.*, whatever is bad cannot be true or real. Animal pain, cancer, moral evil are very bad, yet true and real. What is real is real, however bad it may be; and what is not real is not real, however good it might be.

As the Determinist rightly sees, all these appeals to immediate intuitions, or moral[1] and utilitarian considerations, will *not* do. If we are to establish the freedom of the will, we must have definite grounds to go on, or else suspend our judgment. *A priori* grounds will not do; neither have we the right to plead our 'human limitations' and say that Free-Will is a fact, but, like all divine mysteries, it is above reason. At that rate, you can prove black is white. Moreover, 'above reason,' whether applied to Free-Will or the Trinity, is tantamount to saying 'it cannot be translated into human thought,' and this simply means 'it is meaningless for us.' What is incomprehensible is for us 'non-sense.'

The weak point of Determinism lies in what is

[1] Moral considerations do not go for nothing in the quest for truth, and for two reasons: (1) My goodness or badness has much to do with the truth of my convictions, "the double heart makes the double head"; (2) True morality prevents us from turning away from the truth because it is not to our liking: *fiat veritas, ruat coelum.*

usually supposed to constitute its strength, viz., its appeal to causality and logic.

(*a*) *Is the principle of Causality applicable to spiritual beings?* Determinists say Yes; advocates of Free-Will, No. But let us be clear as to what we mean by Causality. Roughly speaking, what we mean by causality is that "every event, everything which comes to pass, everything which happens, must have a cause," but as Croll[1] adds: "The principle of Causality does not affirm that everything must have had a cause. It simply affirms that everything which *began to be*, or *came to pass* must have had a cause." Croll gives us as his definition of Cause: "Everything which begins to be must have had a something preceding without which it would not have begun to be. This something, be it what it may, we call the cause."

Now the reason why Free-Willers demur to the application of the law of causation to spiritual beings is two-fold: (1) The very essence of spirit or personality is a creative self-directing consciousness, —whether in God or man or organisms generally,— which is infinite, absolute, eternal. *It never began to be.* (2) Spirit is uncaused in itself, and when we

[1] We quote Croll's definitions because he happens to be the most clear-headed and accurate definer of such terms as 'cause,' 'force,' 'determination,' etc., that the present writer is acquainted with.

study its effects, we discover that it is a cause which acts in a totally different manner from all other causes known to us.

The first of these two points we need not dwell on here. The one principle for which we stand in these pages is that the self, personality, or immortal centre at the core of our being, is the welling up in us of the eternally complete God-consciousness ever seeking for its own full self-expression in us. If so, it is as eternal and self-caused as God the Infinite Spirit Himself from Whom it sprang, and never began to be.

Our second point is that spirit or personality is the cause of everything that happens in our spiritual experience, our will-choices included, but spirit is a cause which acts in a way totally different from any other cause we know. No sane Free-Willer believes that volitions happen without a cause. He knows as clearly as the Determinist that his will-choices, right or wrong, are determined by the internal 'state of his heart' at the moment of choice. He also knows that every change in this internal state of heart is accompanied by a corresponding change in his will-choices. A will which could produce choices contrary to those determined by our state of heart, or enable me to make different choices without any previous corresponding change of heart, would be a curse and not a boon. An

arbitrary and capricious will of this nature would absolutely hinder and prevent me from expressing my true self, and be the reverse of freedom. A will thus flying in the face of the heart-desire would make its owner, be he God or man, a puppet and not a free spirit. Character determines will, no Free-Willer disputes that ; on the contrary, the Free-Willer calls God's Will free precisely because it is the perfect channel through which the Heart and Mind of God perfectly and freely expresses itself. So I call my will free, because it is not the slave of my petty self as expressed in my present character, but able to identify itself with the true immortal God-self which is my real 'I' and in whose service is perfect freedom. God is not less free, but all the more free, because He cannot lie or contradict His Nature. If His Will, in order to be free, had to be able to act independently of His Heart, God would cease to be God, and His Will would be a chaotic irresponsible will.

This is a long preamble, but a necessary one, for Free-Willers are constantly supposed to endow the will with a freedom in no wise different from mere caprice or chaotic chance. They do nothing of the kind ! All they mean by a free will is that the will is the perfect organ of a free creative self-directing consciousness or self, whose service is perfect freedom.

And just because this self is free and creative, you cannot possibly apply to the will-choices of this creative self-directing personality the law of causality as if the spiritual realm were the counterpart of the realm of inorganic Nature. This is to confuse two things fundamentally distinct, spirit and matter, and for this reason.

In the world of inert matter, cause and effect so exactly tally that the effect or consequent is nothing more nor less than the sum-total of the antecedents (or cause) passing into and becoming embodied in the consequent (or effect). The cause passes away into its effects and ceases to exist in its original form, reappearing under another form. For instance, the molecular motion of an impinging bullet ceases to exist as motion and reappears as heat; so it is when heat passes into electricity and electricity into magnetism. They are so mutually convertible that magnetism can be converted back into electricity and electricity into heat. So we may generally say that, in inorganic Nature, what we mean by cause and effect is molecular motion ceasing to exist in one particular form and reappearing under another form into which it has passed and embodied itself, and in such a way that the effect is the sum-total of the cause, neither more nor less.

In organic life we have to deal with a new kind

of cause and effect which is as wide apart as the poles from what we understand by cause and effect in the world of inert matter. In organisms, the cause does *not* pass away into its effects and cease to be. It continues to exist more than ever before. For instance, the soul or vital principle at the core of a jelly-dot of protoplasm is the cause of the jelly-dot's evolution into reptile, quadruped, self-conscious man. Here we have a cause—call it the self, soul, vital principle, personality of the jelly-dot, or what you will,—which does not pass away into its effects, but lives on and maintains itself *in* them; while they in turn, the more they receive from the cause or soul which is their Alpha and Omega, the more they give back to it of their substance and enrich it. The personality or cause of any organic whole—be it plant or animal or man—regains tenfold what it gives away to its members. It finds its life the more it loses it.

As we have seen in Chap. II. § *C.*, in dealing with 'soul-directivity,' we cannot speak of cause and effect in organic life as if it were the counterpart of cause and effect in inert matter, for still another reason. Just because in the inorganic realm the effect is the sum-total of what constitutes the cause, and not so in organic life, we have 'constancy of results' as the note of inert matter, and 'infinite variability as

proved by the results' as the note of organic life. In inert matter there is such uniformity of sequence that, with careful observation, you can exactly formulate its law and predict results with absolute accuracy. In organic life the personality of a plant or an animal, and especially of self-conscious man, is such a creative self-directing cause, so vastly transcending the component parts of the organic whole whose vital principle it is, that you never can predict what its inherent energy will do next. You may know accurately all the past life-experience and present character of an organism, yet its future conduct defies prediction. The creative self-directing personality within the heart of the organism is as creative and as self-directing as God Himself, and tied down though it is to such imperfect media of self-expression as plant or animal or human bodies, it asserts its creativeness and its self-determination in a way that baffles all our calculations.[1]

"Our consciousness," says Bergson, "is essentially a creative self-directing consciousness. . . . In the process of conscious self-change by self-adaptation to environment, each moment swallows up and yet retains

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Life introduces an incalculable element. The vagaries of a fire or a cyclone could all be predicted by Laplace's Calculator, given the initial positions, velocities, and the law of acceleration of the molecules; but no mathematician can calculate the orbit of a common house-fly."

all the preceding moments in a fuller form of existence *by a veritable act of creation.* This creation, or invention, is not caused by the sum-total of preceding acts, though it rests on them and refashions them. Our existence, directed by consciousness, is a sort of self-rolling snowball determining its own direction according to the exigencies of each moment. . . . No two moments of our real life can be perfectly alike. *However conditioned by preceding results, each fresh moment of that life imports a new element of creative invention which no human knowledge of the antecedents, however infinite, could possibly foresee.*"

If man is thus creative and self-directing, then the facts of man's spiritual life cannot possibly square with Determinism. We cannot say that our thoughts, feelings, and volitions are as irrevocably fixed for us according to the laws of causality as are events in inorganic Nature. Man's life and actions cannot thus be summarily dealt with as if we were so many crystals. Man's soul-directivity is in itself as complete, creative, and free as is the God-Spirit its Source, and only determined by its own intrinsic character. Of course, the whole of its creativeness and freedom is never manifested in any finite being; only so much of it as the finite body and its faculties can be made to subserve and express.

In a word, our will is *ultimately* determined by the character of our true self, by the law of our being written in our heart. The indeterminism which sees in will-freedom a freedom which is only freedom and nothing more, is as unreal and impossible as an inside without an outside, or an upper without a lower. But determination by true character, or by the God within us, is no bar to freedom; it is the only true self-determination. If I am spirit of God's spirit, then for me to say, "Thy Will be done," is to obey the prompting of my own personality, to give free scope and full expression to my true self, *i.e.* to be perfectly free. Similarly, if love, truth and goodness are the essential attributes of my true self, then my will is none the less free because it is determined by my true character. Freedom of will means nothing but full power of self-expression. Hence, if hatred and falsehood and selfishness contradict my true self and clog its self-expression, I fetter my will-freedom whenever I let these qualities determine my will. In short, only the will of the saint is free, while the will of the conscious sinner is an enslaved will. In the very act of identifying himself with his lower nature, his will has lost the power of giving expression to his true self and cut itself off from its one true source of freedom.

(*b*) *The strength of Determinism's logic its weakness.* The other great defect of Determinism lies in its testing everything by the canons of a narrow formal logic. In the spiritual sphere, victory does not always fall to him who can best arrange his arguments in syllogisms. For example, apply to the realm of spirit the root-axiom of Logic, the law of Identity, *i.e.* "a thing cannot both be what it is in itself and something else at the same time," —and it utterly breaks down.

At first glance, this logical axiom seems of universal application. Few of us are inclined to quarrel with a logic that says, *e.g.*, this pen is a pen and not the paper I write on. We are so apt to view objects as independent units, individual entities standing side by side and mutually exclusive, that the axiom seems a self-evident and indisputable fact. So it *is* in the realm of inert matter. But apply it to any spiritual or organic whole, and see what happens. Take the well-worn but typical instance of the Body and its members. Can the leg say to the arm, belly, head or heart, I am not you and have no need of you; I exist in, by and for myself? Nothing of the kind! It only so exists as a dead amputated leg which has ceased to possess the very attributes essential to a leg. It is now really no leg at all. It only exists as a

true leg in and through the arm, belly, head, and heart and a number of other members which are not itself, but other than itself, outside it spatially and yet part and parcel of its very being. It and they are vitally and indissolubly knit together into one compact organic whole. They are related to each other and to the whole by a dynamic unifying life-principle which is their source and soul, and apart from which they are robbed of their essence and value. Different as they are in themselves, they are essentially one living, indivisible, harmonious whole, where each part is related to every other part and subserves the purpose of the whole. "Each the whole its substance gives, each in each other works and lives" (Goethe). Dissect the whole into its component parts, and you instantly squeeze the life out of it and them. The quickening essence and link that binds and vivifies all into one organic whole is gone beyond recall.

So it is exactly in the realm of spirit. God, the Infinite Spirit, and man, spirit of His Spirit, are one organic whole; and such is the solidarity of it that not one member can suffer or rejoice without every other member, and the whole, being sympathetically affected. I can no more live my life as man apart from God or other men than I can breathe in a vacuum, or an amputated leg can

walk. It is of the very essence of spirit to live its life in other spirits, and escape from it no man can, however self-sufficing and solitary he may try to be. Try to cut myself off as I will from God and other spirits, ninth-tenths of me is theirs and not of my own making, and my isolation affects them, even as a semi-atrophied limb affects the health of the body. By trying to shut himself up within himself, a man certainly mutilates his own existence and hurts others, but he does not achieve independence. He clogs the communion of spirit with spirit, but annihilate it he cannot.

To be myself, I must be more than myself. I must go out of self to 'another who is another and yet not another.' I must impart to him for his own sake all that is best in myself, lose myself in him to find myself. Apart from my family, my clan, my country, mankind, God, I am but a tiny fraction of myself. Even God in 'splendid isolation' would cease to be God. It would rob Him of His most essential attribute, outgoing Love, but of far more than this. As we have seen, Nature, man, God are one organic whole, and God is its source and life and soul. Now, as in all organic wholes, the more the members receive from their source and soul, the more they give back to it of their substance. Far from losing what it gives to its

organic members, it receives it back with interest. A God in splendid isolation, Who ceased to give away of the best in Himself, would mar His own self-expression and cease to be God. Hence there never was a time when God was not self-giving and creative; and also we are as necessary to Him as He is to us, if we may say so without irreverence.

It is precisely this solidarity, which is the note of spiritual beings, that makes every one of us either saviours of our fellows or the reverse. The law of vicariousness is writ large, not only on the Cross, but on the whole realm of spirit. "No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself," is a literal fact. According to our goodness or badness, we enter as healing virtue or disease-germs into the moral life of our fellows, and win a blessed or accursed participation in their moral character and work.

All organic wholes are 'unities in differences' of this kind, where Logic's Law of Identity utterly breaks down. To give one other instance. I have a lower as well as a higher self. My animal impulses and desires are not my real 'I'; far from it, for there is that in them which wars against and contradicts my true self. Yet these lower desires have an indispensable part to play in my real self-expression. It is not by annihilating these impulses,

but by taking them up into my true self, purging them of their baseness, transfiguring them into elements of my spiritual life, that I truly realise myself. The spiritual life presupposes these very desires and impulses and could not exist without them. The differences, discords, contradictions apparent in my nature, are the raw-material out of which my true expression is to be wrought, not by the annihilation of these lower tendencies, but by their elevation into essential unity with my true aspirations and ends.

All spiritual realities are unities in differences of this nature, "selves which are at once themselves and other than themselves." How can the logical law of Identity apply to them? It says: 'A thing cannot at once be itself and other than itself'; choose one or the other, but you cannot have it both ways. It must be *either* this, *or* that.

For instance, formal Logic insists: Either God is Infinite, or He is Finite. If Infinite, then there are no free finite spirits, for they would be independent units outside His Spirit and limit Him. Again, Logic says: Either the will is free, or it is determined; it cannot be both at once, etc. etc.

Is this hard-and-fast 'either' 'or' of Logic true to fact? In order to safeguard Logic's narrow law of self-identity, must we seize upon one necessary

aspect only of Truth and sacrifice another aspect equally necessary? Is God's freedom not free, because it is determined by His Love, Truth, and Goodness? Are we to conceive of God's Infinity as something which spreads itself out *spatially* all over the universe to the exclusion of all other free spirits but His own, or does not this deny and contradict the very essence and meaning of 'spirit'? Must we reject either the mercy or Righteousness of God, because they seem to involve a contradiction in terms, whereas they are really the self-expression of one and the same Love? Are we to view as mere dreams, void of all substance and meaning, the apparently self-contradictory utterances in which the deepest and truest spiritual experience of all ages spontaneously clothes itself, *e.g.*, "Whose service is perfect freedom;" "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me;" "It is God that worketh in me both to will and to do of His good pleasure;" "He that loseth his life shall find it;" "Become what you are," etc.?

They may be very bad logic, but they are among the truest facts and mightiest forces on earth. To take only one of these paradoxical sayings,—and it bears directly on our subject,—"It is God that worketh in me both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Logic passes these words of Paul

through its sieve and tells us: This is non-sense as it stands. Paul must say either, 'It is God's Will and not mine,' or, 'It is my will and not God's.' It cannot be both at once, unless Paul blots out his individuality altogether in a kind of pantheistic absorption.

Why cannot it be both at once without pantheistic absorption? You might as well say that a branch is not itself till it is cut off from the Vine whence it derives all its sap and vitality. Surely, each individual member of an organic whole is and must be at one with the whole so as to realise its own true individuality, while the whole cannot realise its true Self till it finds its self-expression through its members. One is absolutely indispensable to the other. As spirit of God's Spirit, can I have any other or higher ideal of true self-expression than that my thoughts and affections and volitions should be in living accord with God's? And can God's knowledge and Love find better self-expression than in the knowledge of the minds that know with His knowledge and in the self-surrender of the hearts that love with His love? Does God's imparting of His best to us make God less God, and does it blot out our individuality to rise above ourselves by freely falling into line with Him?

All we have said in this chapter flows from the one principle for which we stand throughout: Our personality is God's Personality welling up in us. It is because we are partial incarnations of God, spirit of His Spirit, that we share the completeness, creativeness, freedom, self-directivity which is the property of His Spirit. While pent in this body of flesh, we manifest this eternal spirit under finite conditions of time and place, and it can only express itself in us in so far as the vehicles of its self-expression, our body and its faculties, can be made to subserve that expression. But God's creativeness and freedom *are* "in part" ours, and we create ourselves and influence the cosmic process.[1] We are immeasurably more than we can ever realise here. Our relation to God and to the whole is beyond our present grasp, "for all the relations we can conceive are between objects and parts and phenomena" (Tyrrell). Our self-knowledge, therefore, is not the measure of what we are. In the flesh "we only see through a glass, darkly: and only know in part," but when we are "clothed upon with our house

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "Where inorganic matter alone is concerned, there everything is determined. Wherever full consciousness has entered new powers arise, and the faculties and desires of the conscious parts of the scheme have an effect upon the whole. It is not guided from outside but from within, and the guiding power is immanent at every instant. Of this guiding power we are a small, but not wholly insignificant portion."

which is from heaven," we shall see "face to face, and know as we are known."

But, even here, we share the freedom of God's Will and the absolute knowledge of His Mind. Our intuitive conviction that our will is free is not an illusion, while our self-dissatisfaction with whatever standard of knowledge and goodness we have attained, is in itself a proof that here and now we are aware of truth and goodness with something of the awareness of God. It is not we that think, but God that thinketh in us; yet the light of our candle is no less ours because we have lighted it at God's Sun.[1] So of our will; "it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure," yet our will is most ours, when it is God's as well.

As members of the organic whole of which God is the Source and Soul, we cannot do without Him, He cannot do without us. Our highest perfection as individual free spirits consists, not in a spurious and impossible independence, but in that free and full communion or at-one-ment with Him, which

[1] Cf. Prof. H. Jones: "Power passes from will to will undiminished, and knowledge, goodness and love from spirit to spirit. Our light is not the less our own because it is borrowed. For what spirit borrows, it appropriates; what it appropriates, it assimilates; and what it assimilates becomes itself, without ceasing to be another's."

makes our heart and mind and will the perfect channels of His thoughts and affections and volitions, so that our mind thinks His thoughts, our heart loves with His love, our will wills His Will.

And we do not thereby absorb ourselves in God, nor abdicate our individuality. Even if our thoughts at their best are His thoughts and our true will His Will, all history proves, and the very mystery of evil proves, that God does not thrust either His thought or will mechanically or forcibly upon us. He respects our freedom and personality too much for that. He does influence our minds and wills, but suasively from within ourselves and only by prompting and appealing to the highest in ourselves, even as we do in our influence on each other. Thus is God suasively winning us to become free and fit fellow-workers with Him in His eternal purpose which He can only achieve in and through us.

For if History proves anything, it is that an Absolute Idea is being evolved in the universe. Whatever the language in which we express this Idea, whether we say, with Matthew Arnold, "there is a Power not ourselves that makes for righteousness," or with Tennyson, "through the ages an increasing purpose runs," or, with Christ, call it

"The coming of the Kingdom of God,"—we agree that, in and through men, God is working for a definite end. He will not, and cannot, revoke His gift of freedom to us, and it is open to us either to speed or hinder the coming of His Kingdom, though frustrate it we cannot.[1]

> "Our wills are ours, we know not how,
> Our wills are ours to make them Thine."
>
> TENNYSON, *In Memoriam*.

[1] Cf. B. A. A.: "The Loom of Time is complicated by a multitude of free agents who can modify the web, making the product more beautiful or more ugly as they are in harmony or disharmony with the general scheme. Our ability thus to work for weal or woe is no illusion: it is a reality, a responsible power which conscious agents possess; wherefore the resulting fabric is not something pre-ordained and inexorable, though by wide knowledge of character it may be inferred. Nothing is inexorable except the uniform progress of time; the cloth must be woven, the pattern, the design for the weaving is already, in some sort, there, but the pattern is not wholly fixed and mechanically calculable. . . . The guiding power is from within, and of this guiding power we are a small but not wholly insignificant portion."

CHAPTER VII

CONSCIENCE

LET us gather up the threads of our argument so far as it has gone. Taking Nature as our first guide, we saw that a Universe described in evolutionary terms is a universe characterised by unity of plan, tendency, purpose. *Unity of plan*—the scientific axiom of the Uniformity of Nature means this and nothing else. *Tendency*, we see clear marks of this tendency in the continuous upward trend from amœba to man. *Purpose*, "Deny this tendency in Nature to achieve cumulative ends, and you deny evolution; admit it, and you admit purpose" (Prof. Dewey).

On these grounds, and especially in the light of the Directivity which characterises all organic life, we assumed the existence of a purposive mind in or behind Nature and guiding its evolution. We discarded the materialistic explanation of the universe which views it as the outcome of "the redistribution of matter in motion worked upon by blind Force."

On purely scientific grounds, we found the key to an evolution which starts from nebular molecules and ends in self-conscious man in the highest factor of this evolution and not its lowest, in spirit and not matter. We concluded that "if you insist on seeing in matter the cause of mind, it is because matter is more than matter, and virtually contains all that mind is," *i.e.* we must spiritualise matter, not materialise mind.

At first glance, this seemed to raise more difficulties than it solved. The materialism we had rejected was nothing if not monism simple and self-consistent: 'All is matter; mind is the by-product of matter.' Here everything hangs well together on one single principle. Our explanation apparently landed us in dualism. Instead of one mystery, 'matter,' we now have two, mind and matter, or rather three, God, human mind, matter.

Materialists naturally retorted:—You get behind the mystery of matter and invent a First Cause or Creator Who calls it into being and moulds it as an Artist. Who made this creative Mind? Our question is every whit as pertinent as yours: who made matter? For the life of us we cannot conceive why matter should not be as eternal as mind. Anyhow, you give us two distinct and independent entities, a spiritual mind and inorganic

matter. From your dualistic standpoint how can mind create matter or act on matter at all? As students of science, we greatly prefer the hypothesis based on the fewest assumptions. Materialism is based on one, the eternity of matter, a perfectly conceivable assumption; and from it logically flows the whole system of materialism. Moreover, it is based on fact, for matter is an objective fact. Your theory is based on three inexplicables: (1) Mind, a phenomenon of late appearance; (2) matter; (3) the relation and interaction between mind and matter.

In our next chapter we cross-examined mind and matter, and discovered that the alleged dualism is not there at all. There is an external world, but we can only interpret it through mind and in terms of mind, while the independent existence of matter, as popularly defined, is more than an open question. All our ideas of external objects are mind-manufactured and there is no identity, only a poor correspondence, between our thoughts of the external world and what it is in itself. Indeed, we have here the best proof that matter is spiritual and not material. Confessedly, our knowledge of Nature is subjective and inadequate, yet it works out perfectly satisfactorily in practice. Why? Only one intelligent answer is possible. Man's mind reads and

interprets Nature correctly, because Nature is herself the realised thought of a mind akin to our mind.

Thus the alleged dualism between mind and matter vanishes, and God, man, Nature are no longer three independent entities, but one coherent, organic whole. Nature is the realised thought of Mind, man's mind is God's Mind welling up in ourselves. Thus Idealism also gives us monism pure and simple; everything hangs together on one single principle. And the monism of Idealism has this immense advantage over Materialism, it does not ask us to accept the incredible. Everything is easily derivable from mind, but if you start with matter, how are you to perform the impossible miracle of getting self-conscious mind out of it? You evolve the highest phenomenon in existence out of a lowest factor which is as impotent to produce it as 3×1 to produce 20.

If Idealism is right and man's mind is mind of God's Mind, a pale reproduction or copy of it, then a knowledge of the human mind will put us on the right track to the knowledge of God's Mind. In thus anthropomorphising God we do not make Him in our image; it is He who has made us in His image. Therefore our anthropomorphism of God is not only a psychological necessity, but God's own method of revealing Himself to us.

This naturally led us to our next chapter, 'Personality in Man,' and these we found to be the chief notes of human personality. It is ever one and the same, creative, self-conscious, self-directing, an 'immortal centre' whose three faculties of self-expression are our heart and mind and will. Our personality has an ideal which it thrusts upon us as a categorical imperative, and it gives us no rest till we achieve it. Hence our 'soul-hunger' or self-dissatisfaction. This involves freedom of the will, for we cannot obey the soul's categorical imperative, do and be what we know we ought to do and be, unless the making of ourselves lies mainly in our own hands. Besides our conscious self, we also have a larger self which we call our subconscious or subliminal mind.

The question now before us is this: whence come to us these ideals, this categorical imperative, this soul-hunger? Why does our conscience speak to us with such a commanding voice of authority? Why do we realise an inward joy when we identify ourselves with the line of character or action it maps out for us as our duty, while we are conscious of a pain and friction when we acquiesce in whatever runs counter to its dictates?

These are facts of actual experience. How explain

them? Are these aspirations and ideals, this joy and remorse, our own subjective creations, or have they some deeper source and reason?

Both answers find advocates. Naturalism, for instance, refuses to see anything supernatural or outside ourselves in our moral sense and its ideals. Our human nature supplies the raw material for it all. Temperament, ignorance, tradition, imagination are the soil from which our aspirations and conscience spring. They are our own unconscious creations.

Thus Comtists trace conscience and all our spiritual ideals to our animal-instincts of self-preservation and reproduction. These instincts compel men and even animals to herd together for protection against foes. Such societies cannot exist without strict rules subordinating individual selfish inclinations to the common welfare of the clan. Hence my 'duty to my neighbour' was in force from the earliest days on purely selfish and utilitarian grounds. So with our 'duty to God' and our spiritual ideals. Terror first suggested piety, and gods were discovered behind storms and earthquakes. These terrible beings could hurt men, and must be humoured or appeased. Priests and other wise men were not slow to avail themselves of this awe as a popular lever for their own or the clan's

good. This and that was declared "taboo," that is, god-ordered or forbidden, on penalty of his dire vengeance. Our 'duty to God,' with its 'thou shalt nots,' is wholly built on taboo. In a few generations, obedience to these social and religious rules became an ingrained habit, then an instinct, the instinct of conscience.

But if conscience springs from social utilitarian needs, how does it come about that at every stage of man's history conscience sits in judgment on and breaks the laws of society? If the sense of obligation springs from society itself, why does our sense of duty rise so infinitely above the social standard and refuse to be merged in it? Can a spring rise above its own source? Why is man at all times dissatisfied with the social and religious standard as it is, and its laws, and often best fulfil the law by breaking it? Why does our conscience applaud a Christ Who does violence to existing social and religious laws, however time-honoured and hallowed their sanction, and sets them at nought in the interests of society and religion itself? Once more, why does conscience, refusing to be merged in the social consciousness, ever set up for itself an ideal society, a Kingdom of God, a society straining after that justice, truth and love which alone satisfy conscience-needs?

No, Comte's answer will *not* do. Conscience-morality is not a set of prudential rules enacted by a self-regarding society for its own utilitarian ends, neither is conscience the outcome of many previous whippings. Our moral sense may strike its roots even below man, far down in the soil of the altruistic feelings and needs of parental love and gregarious instincts; it may be, nay, it is fostered by society; but its real source goes far deeper still, right down to the very depths of the soul.

The mere fact that, at every stage of our evolution, we are conscious of a capacity for goodness and knowledge which no actual attainment on our part ever satisfies, conscious of boundless possibilities and a standard of perfection which dwarf and throw contempt on our highest achievements, proves that we must go far beyond the individual or the social consciousness to account for conscience or its ideals. Our high ideal of goodness and knowledge, our constant quest after an absolute Truth and an absolute Goodness, show that from the very beginning of that quest our mind has already somehow reached its goal, or is in close touch with it. As we shall see later, only one explanation covers the facts.

Another naturalistic explanation of conscience is the 'illusion' theory, which makes our moral sense and its ideals merely an ingenious device of Natural

Selection, one of the baits and traps which Nature uses in the interests of the survival of the race, her one and only aim. A naturalistic creed which sees in mind the by-product of matter, does not hesitate to rank our moral sense on a par with our animal-appetites. Nature provides both for us without consulting us. As A. J. Balfour writes: "On this creed, the august sentiments which cling to the ideas of duty and self-sacrifice are nothing better than a device of Nature to trick us into the performance of altruistic actions. These are good and useful to the tribe, and Nature, though she is indifferent to our happiness or morals, but sedulous for our survival, commends altruism to us by decking it out with showy splendours and artificially high sentiments. If altruism had been our natural instinct, she would as readily have done the same trick for selfishness, greed, etc., and called these noble. Naturalistically, morality is only an ingenious device of Natural Selection, like the protective blotches on a beetle's back."

In short, conscience, self-sacrifice, heroism are biologically on a level with our coarsest appetites. Our sympathetic admiration for these altruistic virtues is only Nature's clever way of checkmating our selfish appetites. So also our feeling of freedom, responsibility, remorse, repentance are only illusions, useful make-beliefs tending to the survival of the race.

Evidently, Nature blundered terribly in evolving self-conscious man, aware of her processes and ends, able to read and unmask her baits and traps. Now his eyes are open to her tricks, how is the feeling of the 'beauty of holiness' to survive, and why should he set moral duties on a pedestal or resent wrong acts in himself or others? And if the survival of the race, as naturalism admits, hangs on these altruistic virtues, then the race is doomed. No wonder naturalism ascribes all that is to 'matter worked upon by *blind* Force'!

But we need not again seriously discuss the views of a naturalistic school whose inconsistencies are notorious. It deifies human intellect, yet makes it the child of the clash of atoms; it insists on the Uniformity of Nature, yet its 'blind force' makes this uniformity and all knowledge an impossibility; its objective facts are bare inferences, yet it ignores the only facts we really know, the facts of consciousness; it worships causation, yet makes matter produce mind, that is, puts into the consequent what is not contained in the antecedent.

Their illusion-theory is not all false. God undoubtedly uses 'baits and traps' for the good of the race, for He ever 'screens His creatures from premature ideas.' Evolution proves it. Man may have been 'present as an ideal upon earth from

the beginning of organisms,' but the road is long, and could he have seen the whole of his journey from start to finish at the outset, his heart would have failed within him. God knows that, and makes us take 'short views.' There is sound philosophy in the remark of the coach-driver who had his same sixty miles a day to do: "It would weary me to death if it were as straight as a railway. I like the many turnings and windings which trick me by putting the long journey in the form of easy little bits." All along the line of organic evolution, each organism, from amœba to man, works out a little bit of God's plan, just that little step forward allotted to it. At each stage, the ideal of that stage looks final, yet it only proves a stepping-stone to the next. Man has already been some hundreds of thousands of years at it, ideal has superseded ideal and there are still very many more before him, for he has only just started. Our final ideal, our best good, would probably not seem good to us yet; so we have to be treated as school-children who are offered prizes and praise by their teachers, though these things are not the end of education. "To-day, if ye will hear My voice, ye shall enter into My rest," has been a divinely implanted hope in man from Adam's day onwards. We toil after this 'promised rest,' yet it ever eludes us, though the failure is more

than victory. We attain our present ideal and it at once fails to satisfy us any longer, but spurs us on to another. Yet we do not complain, for we instantly see that although we have "not received our promised rest, some better thing is provided for us." We have succeeded in that we seemed to fail, and learnt that no pure hope withers except that some purer hope may spring out of its roots.

Thus illusion plays a large part in God's economy of grace. But this *illusion* is not the *delusion* of naturalism. An illusion is an inadequate conception, *but in the line of truth*; a delusion is a false one. Thus it was an illusion in primitive man to see gods in trees and brooks, and later on to make God literally a magnified man, but it ran in the line of truth. We begin by making God in our own image, but as our reason widens, we find it was God all along Who was elevating us step by step into His image. Imagination dreamt a God, Reason sees Him with its eyes wide open; but the dream was sent by the same Power that afterwards revealed the clearer truth in ourselves. Our inadequate conceptions of Him are necessarily *illusory*, but not therefore delusive.

Thus Naturalism's two explanations of Conscience: (1) It is the creation of social utilitarian needs;

(2) an "illusion" of Nature,—are partly true, yet less than half-truths.

What, then, and whence are our moral sense and its ideals? Our previous chapters have been written in vain if they do not suggest the answer. If man's spirit is spirit of God's Spirit, and our consciousness is the Consciousness of God welling up in ourselves, then Conscience is God's own Voice within us. "It not only tells us that God is, but what He is," says Newman, and it is through conscience that we have the crowning argument for the existence of God and His Goodness.

Conscience, the Voice of God,—this is not a mere word-picture, but literal fact. As we have said times without number, God, Nature, Man are one organic whole, with God as the Soul of it. From all eternity, God contained within Himself all that of which Nature and Man are a manifestation. Nature is His expressed Mind and Will, Man is spirit of His Spirit. Paradoxical as it sounds, it is in and through man that God means to realise the riches of His Infinite nature.[1] As Infinite Spirit

[1] Cf. Prof. Royce: "Not otherwise can absolute personality exist than as mediated through the unification of the lives of imperfect and finite personalities. Not otherwise can the infinite live than through incarnation in finite form, and a rewinning of its total meaning through a conquest of its own finitude of expression."

He is the Spirit of outgoing Love, and it is of His essence to lose Himself to find Himself. This in no wise limits God's Infinity. As Principal Caird says: "An Infinite Spirit which is limited only by that which makes Love possible is higher and *more* Infinite than an Infinite which is nothing but the boundlessness and absence of all limits."

In Jesus we see what God incarnated in man can make of man when He finds him perfectly responsive, attuned, receptive. In the rest of us, He finds but poor vehicles of His perfect self-expression. We have not in us yet the Mind of Him Whose Will was to do God's Will, a lesson even He learnt "through the things He suffered," increasing "in wisdom, as well as in stature and favour with God and man."

What has all this to do with Conscience? Much, every way. God's failure to find His perfect self-expression in us is precisely the reason of our 'soul-hunger' and the accusing voice within us. "Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou thus disquieted within me?" and again: "In me dwelleth no good thing. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" —is the cry of the God in us thirsting after self-expression and failing to achieve it. As Prof. Royce strongly puts it: "In me, as now I am, God is dissatisfied with Himself in so far as now He is

only partially expressed in me. I am a form of that divine dissatisfaction which constitutes the whole temporal order, the 'groaning creation.' This is my link with God, that now I am discontent with the expression of my personality."

Our boundless ideals of Truth and Goodness are the proofs of this indwelling God-Consciousness in us, here and now, in all its completeness. It is by virtue of It that I am myself conscious of a capacity of all truth, all knowledge, all goodness. Browning's words are not mere poetical fancy: "There is an immortal centre in us all, where truth abides in fulness; all around, wall upon wall, the gross flesh hems it in." If we will but make our own 'the mind that was in Christ Jesus,' and present ourselves, even as He did, 'through the eternal spirit without spot unto God,' the potential awareness of all things with the awareness of God which is ours will be actualised, and we shall think His thoughts, will His Will, love with His Love, 'know God, or rather be known of God.'

It is by virtue of this God-Consciousness in us that we have a universal side to our nature as well as an individual side, are 'knowers' of all truth and goodness; this is why we stand for permanent interests, at the very centre of the universe, and not as mere flies on its rim.

Now this God-Consciousness or God-Reason in us manifests itself in our Mind and Conscience. We may, if we like, differentiate the two in thought, calling one the Reason of the Mind and the other the Reason of the Heart. For practical purposes we do so, but it is a purely artifical distinction. We can no more draw a hard-and-fast line between the two than we can between the three faculties of the soul, which are merely functions of one and the same 'I.' The Reason or God-Light in us which has to do with knowledge, and the Reason or God-Light in us which has to do with goodness are not two Reasons, but one. There is no dualism in God's Reason, and there should be none in ours. Reason is a seamless whole, and, as such, knows in its actions and is morally active in its knowledge, for 'the double heart makes the double head.' Hegel is right after all. Knowledge or Thought is the root of Religion. This we can say, and yet hold strongly that Religion is a character, an inner experience, a life, a question of values. Call it 'Reason of the Heart,' if you will, but underline Reason as well as Heart.

Conscience, then, is the Voice of God in our heart. Can we now be surprised at its 'categorical imperative'? How can the God-Reason commands be aught but authoritative or of universal applica-

tion? Its laws of right and goodness are every whit as true and eternal as the laws of mathematics. Even as our mind refuses to conceive of a time or place where the angles of a triangle are not equal to two right angles, so does it refuse to conceive of a time or set of circumstances when love or unselfishness could be wrong.

The laws of right and goodness are authoritative and of universal application because they are God's own handwriting in our heart and in the cosmic process, as the law of their being. But this does not mean that my individual conscience or yours never errs. It often does. Yet it is not the Light of the God-Reason within us that is dim, it is the eye of our own heart. We have to develop, train and exercise our inner eye, just as our bodily eye. This we can only do by a pure and loyal life which will focus its gaze on all that is true and good, and thus accustom it to the light. "The pure in heart see God." Similarly, sensuality and selfishness blur its vision so that all its values are distorted and wrong. "If thine eye be single, thy whole body is full of light; but if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness."

Hence, as already said, it is not God's Light that grows within us, it is our own receptivity of it. We speak of 'progressive revelation,' but the pro-

gressiveness is on our part, not God's. Never at any time has He withheld His revelation from any man. All along, He has yearned to impart to us one and all—not to favoured Jews only—*all* His knowledge and goodness and love, only our eyes were holden. "Eyes have they, and they see not;" our soul-sight and our spiritual growth go hand in hand. Men's 'inspiration' differs just because there are all grades of soul-sight, from the utter blindness of those who 'have eyes, and see not,' by reason of the lie in their souls, right up to the clear vision of the 'pure in heart' who see God. So uniquely pure and at one with God was Jesus that in Him God finds a perfect vehicle of His self-expression, and His Voice is as God's Voice. The rest of us are, at best, poorly attuned to God and bad revealers of Him. Mentally and morally, our views are coloured and distorted by our many limitations, and no saint would claim that his individual conscience was as the voice of God and the final court of appeal.

Conscience, then, is the Voice of God in our heart, and it is through the gateway of Conscience that we pass to the knowledge of the Holiness, Righteousness and Goodness of God.

CHAPTER VIII

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

A

IF our reading of evolution and human personality is true to fact, we now hold in our hands the clue to man's religious instinct. It is the cry of the soul, spirit of God's Spirit, for union with its divine Source; it is the child's instinctive leaning on a Father's breast for love and guidance. "My soul is athirst for the living God." "Show Thou me the way that I should walk in, for I lift up my soul unto Thee."

No race of men has yet been found in whom this instinct was not present. None can deny this as the largest and most ubiquitous fact connected with the existence of mankind on earth. Even the most out-and-out materialist must reckon with this instinct, and for this reason. As a scientist, he will admit that every step in the progress of organic life, from amœba to man, has been achieved by adaptation in the organism in response to *real stimuli* in

the environment. Every single one of our members and organs has come into being in this way under the soul-directivity of the organism. It evolved them in order to interpret the meaning of the *stimulus*.

Now if our universal religious sense or instinct has come into being in response to no real stimulus, then here, for the first and only time in the history of organic evolution, we have something absolutely without explanation or precedent, an instinct pointing aimlessly. In a word, our Directivity has blundered. For some inexplicable reason the soul-directivity which has always guided organisms, and hitherto invariably guided them right, suddenly and unaccountably breaks down and guides them all wrong. It proves utterly untrustworthy, not to one man or one race here and there, but all over the world.

Let those believe this who can. To us, such an utter breakdown of our Directivity seems incredible for this reason. It is a well-known law of biology that an instinct, sense, or faculty which serves no purpose, that is, which has no real stimulus in its environment with which it is in correspondence, invariably dies of atrophy. The sightless eyes of cave-dwelling fishes, and our own 'rudimentary organs,' are cases in point. Now it is generally

admitted that never was man more religious *at heart* than to-day, careless as he may often seem of the outward forms and observances of religion. "This age longs to be religious," said Liddon thirty years ago, and it is truer still to-day.[1] Modern man, despite his ratiocinative challengings, has a pronounced bent towards religion. The present falling off at religious services is often quoted as a standing witness to the irreligious tendency of the age. Is it not rather a proof that man is so in earnest that he refuses to receive a stone when he asks for bread? Man is bidding a definite farewell, not to religion, not to thoughts of God, not to Christ, but to official dogmas about God, Christ and Religion. As Sabatier truly says: "Il n'est qu'un homme athée et un impie; c'est l'homme frivole, qui se raille et se méprise de tout. . . . Avant de se moquer de Dieu il faut que l'homme commence par se moquer de soi." A deep reader of the human heart, some three thousand years ago, said the same thing: "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."

A religion of some sort all men must have; it is

[1] Cf. *Times* Leader, Sept. 5, 1913: "Religion is becoming more of a reality in the minds and lives of this generation. . . . Our day is marked by an increasing religious spirit, in spite of the decay in the habit of church-going, a decay largely due to the fact that we have left behind us the idea of religion as mainly a matter of forms and ceremonies."

only their gods that differ. Crush the religious instinct no man can. As our soul-hunger proves, it cannot die till our true self, the God within us, dies. Seal its natural outlet as you will, it will volcanically force its way out somehow and run in some other channel. Even those who discard official religion and have forsworn it altogether, are compelled to divert this innate religious tendency of man into some other channel and build altars to a god of some sort, and, like Comte or Cotter Morrison, bid us addict ourselves to the Service of Man. One man worships truth, another philosophy, a third beauty, a fourth philanthropy, and so forth, and they know not that all the while they are groping after the Unknown God, if haply they may find Him.

The religious instinct is eternal, and those who prophesy its speedy end mistake religion for its outward theological forms. Forms have their day and cease to be, for they are man-made. Religion is God-implanted and never dies. Both friends and foes of religion are too apt to be pessimistic or triumphant, fancying its days are numbered. They overlook its source and essence in the human heart. They forget that, as part and parcel of our being, religion is an indispensable element in man's outfit as a whole man. We can "muddle through"

existence without it, but it is essential to the full expression of human life.

The late G. J. Romanes, an authority on this subject, openly stated that it seemed to him impossible to account for the universal religious instinct of mankind if its assurance of an unseen Personal God, with Whom it believes itself to be in touch, is a pure illusion.

We do not wish to press this 'universal instinct' argument unduly. It is valid, but inadequate in itself. Religion is a dream we all dream, yet if its universality were its only justification, it might possibly be set down to hallucination or self-suggestion. But take it in conjunction with the cosmological, teleological and ontological proofs already adduced, and we have a chain of evidence pointing to the existence of a Personal God which will stand any strain that may be put upon it.

(1) Science's Uniformity of Nature reveals Nature as a rational unity, *i.e.* if force be the motive-power, there must be one force and no more; and if God, there must be one God and no more. The various 'forces' of Nature are but different manifestations of the One Force that moves the whole. If they were independent, we should have a multiverse. (2) Evolution suggests almost convincingly in itself that this One Energy is a purposive Mind. (3) Philosophy

is compelled to assume a Supreme Mind as the ground and guarantee of our knowledge and goodness; and, as we saw three chapters back, human personality clearly points to an all-embracing creative self-directing Consciousness as the key to our own. —We may call in question any single one of these arguments, but their cumulative and corroborative evidence carries conviction with it. In conjunction with them, as Romanes saw, (4) religious experience, especially in its highest manifestations, may rightly be brought forward as an additional and strong proof of the existence of a Personal God.

Thank God! our faith in God is not the outcome of logical proofs. These proofs and evidences are only attempts to account for, explain, and justify to our intelligence convictions which existed long before our minds busied themselves with proofs. As we live first and reflect on life afterwards, so we are religious first and reflect on our religion, or become theological, afterwards. Proofs are only afterthoughts, ways of explaining and not of attaining religious life.

Among the convictions we hold, not only in religion but on all vital matters, but few are the result of methodical demonstration. We always defend our beliefs by reasons, when attacked, but it is not because of reasons we believe them. Our

reasonings may act as buttresses to our beliefs, but the beliefs themselves shone before us long before. As A. J. Balfour says: "The part reasoning plays in our vital life is about as large as our questionings as to what is good food for us on the physical side, that is, small compared with our natural digestion, as to health, and this acts of itself automatically." Reasoning is not the only attribute of man, nor is it the only faculty which he habitually employs for the ascertainment of truth. Moral and spiritual faculties are of no less importance in their respective spheres. Even in ordinary everyday life, *e.g.*, in ascertaining truth as to character and beauty, surely faith, trust and taste are every whit as needful as reasoning. It is only in judgments of existence that reasoning is mainly needed, elsewhere it is our moral and spiritual faculties. Faith has been defined as "conviction apart from or in excess of proof," and Mr. Balfour is right in maintaining that it is on faith that three-quarters of the convictions of daily life are founded, no less than the loftiest creeds, while Science herself, as we have seen, ultimately rests on a faith-venture.

Religion is a character and a life, and even as we live before we can reflect on life, and are personalities before we can have a psychology, so with religion. Theology, or reflection on religious heart-experience,

presupposes religion before thought can turn back to reflect on the significance of its own creations and read into them their rational meaning, showing that Religion is Heart-Reason not aware of itself that it is reason. But the truly religious heart needs no proofs. Indeed, he almost recoils from the cold analysis of his convictions. He does not seek to verify or justify their existence; his spiritual convictions are *there* beyond the reach of doubt. His inner experience is part and parcel of himself, an indescribable feeling of intimate personal touch and actual at-one-ness with God, a feeling rich, full to a degree, transfiguring his whole life. Describe it he cannot; no one can realise it but he who experiences it. He can only suggest it as a feeling of harmony and peace and joy, an inner light, a state of heart 'which passeth all understanding.' It is not mere passive feeling. A power greater than our own is in us and with us, suasively winning us to co-operate with it and heed its prompting.[1] It is the exaltation of life. Describe the Presence we cannot, but we *know* it is there, and we know it

[1] It is something that possesses us, not that we possess. Cf. Augustine: "I entered the secret closet of my soul and beheld the light that never changes, above the eye of the soul, above my intelligence. It was altogether different from any earthly illumination. It was above me because it made me, and I was lower because I was made by it." Cf. Paul, "I, yet not I."

transfigures our whole life and character. We know it intuitively in a way that our critical understanding can never grasp. Cast this intuitive knowledge of the presence, love, and power of God in us into syllogistic propositions or logical proof we cannot, any more than my love for my child or hers for me admits of mathematical demonstration. The religious heart asks for no such proof. The reality is too deep. It comes to him with a force of conviction which he feels no need to define or defend.[1]

Yet these proofs of the *objective* truth of our belief in God have their use. Kant notwithstanding, they are neither impossible nor unnecessary, and they will always occupy human thought. It is right they should, for we must "be ready always to give every man that asketh of us a reason of the hope that is in us." True, the philosophy of religion does not pretend to make a man pious, any more than ethics makes a man moral. True, also, that it is impossible to enjoy at one and the same moment the warm glow of devotion and the colder satisfaction of reflective thought. Yet Religion and

[1] Cf. our heart-attitude towards Jesus. In His Presence we are conscious of a strength and influence pouring into our soul, a love of God which awes yet gladdens. Define it we cannot; we feel it. "Thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." Its seat is in the indefinable and subtle realm of personality.

Theology both have their use and place in life, especially to-day when we want convictions, not borrowed opinions, and what enters the heart must also satisfy the head. We cannot keep our heart-beliefs in one water-tight compartment of our personality and our head-beliefs in another. Theology is not the rival of Religion, only its handmaiden, and all true and deep religious experience must pass through the reflective stage. Theology may not engender religion in a heart where it does not already find a home, but it certainly will strengthen and intensify that heart-faith if it is there. Of this we may be sure, a Religion which is not essentially reasonable cannot be a satisfying or final religion. A religion which is 'above reason' is one that cannot be interpreted in terms of human thought, and, in so far as it is inconceivable or incomprehensible, it is really meaningless; while if there is any element in religion 'contrary to reason,' that religion in so far ceases to be religious at all. Faith may be 'conviction in excess of proof,' yet we intuitively know it is capable of proof, though we may not be able to frame it in logical form, and this is what we mean by our definition: Religion is Heart-Reason not aware of itself that it is reason.

B

The natural question will instantly be raised: It is all well and good for you to say that a Religion which cannot be interpreted in terms of human thought is meaningless, but can the thing be done? On your own showing, religion is a matter of intense feeling, an emotion of the heart as incommunicable to any but those who experience it as is the idea of colour to a man born blind. Where are you to find words and ideas adequate to interpret this warm unutterable experience of a heart aglow and enlightened by the Spirit of God? Theologians have vainly tried for ages to achieve this impossible feat, to translate faith into creed, spirit into letter, and failed as they must invariably fail. Indeed, their laborious and futile attempts to crystallise the ineffable data of consciousness in dogma have all but stifled religion and given rise to endless wranglings and wordy hair-splittings.

This is the old, old question:—Is there room for dogma and Authority in a Religion of the Spirit? Does not heart-religion instinctively recoil from arid scholastic definitions and formulas which squeeze all the life out of it and leave us with the bare skeleton? And what has a Religion of the Spirit to do with Authority? Are not they who worship God

in spirit and in truth a law unto themselves by reason of their inner light? Does not the indwelling Spirit of God Himself write His law in their hearts and guide them into all truth, so that they need not be taught of any man or lean on any external authority, institution, or creed? (Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.; cf. Heb. viii. 10). Is not this the definition of Religion given by Christ Himself at the Samaritan well?

But is Religion all feeling, and did Christ never reflect on His heart-experience or interpret it to others and communicate it to others in words and ideas? And what do we really mean by dogma and authority?

Roughly speaking, a dogma is the symbolic interpretation of the inner experience of a heart enlightened by the Spirit of God and actively alive in and through its close touch with God. Now we readily grant that it would be impossible to give expression to this emotion of heart if it were pure emotion. But a spiritual being, as we have so frequently seen, cannot experience mere feeling *per se*. My feelings are shot through with thought, for they are the feelings of a being that thinks and wills, and I cannot possibly feel without thinking of my feeling and willing that it should exist in me or not.

For instance, when I speak of the inner experience

of my heart enlightened by the indwelling Presence of God, I mean the feeling of self-surrender, awe, reverence, peace, joy, love; but this does not mean that my heart-experience lies entirely in the sphere of feeling to the exclusion of thought and will. If I merely felt certain emotions of joy or grief, pain or pleasure, elevation or dependence, then, within the sphere of pure feeling, what would there be to distinguish between the ecstasy of the sensualist and the rapture of the saint? They would be much on a level. The very fact of my speaking of my religious feelings as the experience of a heart enlightened by, and in touch with, God, proves that I have consciously thought out that experience and labelled it with a divine character as the outcome of God's energy in me. I have tested my feelings by an objective standard, introduced into them an element of thought and knowledge, constituted a principle by which my feeling must be judged and regulated.

So, after all, although Religion is and must be a thing of the heart, yet the character and worth of my heart-experience is determined, not by the intensity of my feelings,—in that case a sensualist would be intensely religious,—but by my judgment of their value, because I know them to be true, divine, such as to transfigure my whole character. Such an appreciation of my heart-experience goes

far beyond the range of mere feeling; it is a deep act of thought.

Now it is precisely because a positive thought-element enters into our religious experience that we can, in a way, interpret our religious heart-emotions in terms of thought which may enable us to convey a fair impression of our inner experience to others for mutual edification.

. . . . . .

From the very nature of the case, we can only give expression to these unutterable heart-experiences in the language and suggestive word-pictures of poetry, knowing all the while how 'sketchy' is our representation of the reality,—a mere vague idea thrown out as a feeler in the direction of truth. Thus when we speak of God as Father, we use the symbolic language of true dogma. The Fatherhood of God may baffle my understanding, but the picture it suggests to me is of immense value. I can readily grasp the precept it prompts: Behave in your relations with God as in your relations with a father you love and trust, and learn to lean on His breast in loving trust and dependence.

The language of all true dogma is and must be symbolic. Poetry is its natural speech, and for two reasons. Poetry, like Religion itself, hovers midway between sense and spirit, heart and reason. Our

heart-experience, as we have just seen, is not all feeling or all reason, but a blend of the two; and therefore the word-pictures of poetry, which appeal both to the heart that feels and the reason that knows, exactly fit it. Again, poetry aims at truth of idea, which is far truer than truth of fact, for it touches the inner soul of things, and such ideals thrill the heart as nothing else can. Hence it is that all the highest and deepest forms of truth are imaginative, embodied in poetry or symbol or myth. These three are really one, for symbol and myth are the unconscious poetry of the human heart uttering truths too subtle for the mind to grasp.

The deepest heart-readers—poets, seers, prophets —have all been myth and symbol-creators. Thus whenever Plato wished to utter some truth lying deep in the mystery of being, he would instinctively glide into what he called a myth, 'truths embodied in a tale.' There was no other way of expressing the deepest, the ultimate, the ineffable truth which lies at the heart of our spiritual life. The beautiful story of Adam and Eve's temptation is a myth and a gem of truth. Christ's parables are exquisite myths, and they probe to the very soul of things, revealing its deepest truths and thrilling the heart in a way no literal facts can approach.

As with myth, so with symbolism. True symbol-

ism is a word-picture. For instance: "The Lord is my Rock;" "Time, like an ever-rolling stream, bears all its sons away;" "I am the Vine, ye are the branches," are true symbols. All creations of art are symbols, attempts to catch the soul of things and set it before you so that you can *see* it. One of the charms of symbolism is that it half-reveals and half-conceals the truth it pictures. Thus it shares with poetry and myth the power of giving utterance to Religion's ineffable truths which hover between sense and spirit.

All Christ's 'dogmas' are suggestive and 'maieutic' symbols of this kind, word-pictures half-revealing yet half-concealing something higher and better. Even as His two Sacraments, they are mysteries, yet the clearest of revelations. "I am the Vine, ye are the branches, and My Father is the husbandman;" "The light of the body is the eye; if thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light;" "The Kingdom of God is within you;" "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God;" "A well of water within you springing up into everlasting life."

Such dogmas can never die. They are so eternally true, so bound up with our innermost spiritual life. We can never outgrow them so long as our inner life and inner light is there. They are living ideas

that have made themselves a home in us and will not leave off talking to us, thrilling and quickening our heart into active life, transfiguring our whole character. The religion of an individual or Church that is without such dogmas is barren and dead.

. . . . . .

But all dogmas are not of this kind, the spontaneous creations of religious seers with hearts aglow, probing the depths of their soul and giving expression to its life and fire in living, glowing words. Of three-fourths of our dogmas we certainly cannot say this, and for this reason.

All dogmas bear on their features the indelible stamp of the date and place of their birth. The word-picture dogmas of Christ, Apostles, and prophets, were born at a time when men's hearts literally 'burnt within them' and their spiritual life was at white-heat. As time goes on and we leave this golden age of Christianity behind us, the white-heat of the inner life begins to cool and the age of the prophets gives way to that of the scribes. The spiritual temperature has fallen several degrees. The word of the Lord is still very precious, but there are no prophets, neither is there any open vision. Inspiration is at a low ebb and ratiocination replaces it. Piety becomes prosaic and the critical understanding supplants imagination. Men refuse

to call God a Rock, and speak of His strength and immutability. Lacking the prophetic spirit and religious fervour of Apostolic days, and more of the earth earthly, after-generations of Christians entered on the labours and spiritual heritage of the First Church and began to formulate it all in new dogmas of their own. All things in heaven and earth are now passed through the sieve of speculation and of a narrow rationalising logic. Religious controversialists spend laborious days and the resources of metaphysical or logical minds in refining away the human side of Christ's nature so as to make it capable of union with the Godhead of the Father. The living ideas of our Lord's word-pictures are recast into a series of prosaic intellectual propositions with a cut-and-dried wording logically and minutely defined. We already see the small beginnings of this in the Pastorial Epistles. It reaches its climax in the age of the Fathers and their successors.

But let us be fair to Patristic Theology. There is a tendency either to eulogise these intellectual dogmas to the skies or to condemn them to the nethermost hell. Both extremes are equally wrong. Such dogmas have their undoubted place and value, and a very high one at that.

The Fathers and divines of the General Councils

did not sit down in cold blood, like so many academic theologians, to solve metaphysical problems or evolve theoretical doctrines about the Godhead. They were practical men, thoroughly in earnest and deeply spiritual, face to face with heresies threatening to sap the very life of the Faith. It was an Arius and a Pelagius that forced them, nilly willy, to fence and hedge in the 'deposit of faith,' 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.' And they achieved their difficult task to perfection, so far as the needs of their age went; so much so that it was, without a doubt, the Spirit of God present in them that led them into their truths.

The mischief began when the Church declared these dogmas to be Articles of Faith signed, sealed, and delivered for all time; and, worst of all, made creeds and dogmas the mechanical test of a man's rightness of heart. For example, the Gospel says: "Behave towards God as your Father, and towards Christ as your Saviour." Ecclesiasticism says: "If any wills to be saved, he must believe thus and thus about the Nature of the Persons of the Father and of the Son, or perish everlastingly." In this way creeds are substituted for the living faith, and the letter of the dogmas is placed on a level with the spiritual truths they enshrine. The Rule of Faith was a useful weapon against heresy, but when

it was exalted into a fetish, and the repetition of its clauses was looked upon as a sure guarantee of a man's acceptance with God, it spelled death to religion. A religion of the spirit commits suicide when it substitutes an intellectual judgment for a heart-experience or soul-attitude.

To make a fetish of a creed for all time is to forget that in all dogma there are two factors: (1) an inner experience or soul-attitude; (2) its intellectual expression in the words and ideas of the day.—Neither is fixed or final. No one now believes that Inspiration and Revelation came to a dead stop with the last chapter of the New Testament. It is going on now as actively and progressively as ever, as the Spirit of God suasively guides us into all truth. That is to say, man's inner light and heart-experience is steadily growing.—Again, the philosophy of one age is not that of the next. It also steadily grows in clearness and depth with the growth of man's reason and its discoveries. Now if these two facts are true, how can any dogmas remain immutable for all time? To tie us down to-day to Articles of Faith formulated by Councils or Reformers, is to say that for all these centuries both the spiritual and mental life of men has been at a standstill!

Westcott is right: "No formula which expresses

clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the next generation"; and again: "Let us thank God that He has called us to unfold a growing message, not to rehearse a stereotyped tradition."

Timid souls will at once cry out: This will remove all our old landmarks and involve a complete break with the past. What becomes of 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints,' if doctrine is thus fluid and the truth of one generation is not the truth of the next? Are we to be at the mercy of every new wind of doctrine?[1]

No one wishes to tamper with the Faith, but this does not mean that its intellectual expression must ever remain rigid in form and wording. Faith and its formula are as distinct as kernel and shell, tree and bark, soul and body. My soul is none the worse, but all the better capable of self-expression because my body as an adult is not the body of my babyhood or boyhood. Experience shows, the Bible shows, evolution shows that all true organic life is a steady process of growth by

[1] Such timid cries always suggest the question, "Is the Catholic Faith such a weakling that it cannot take care of itself in the battlefield of thought? Is it safe only when doubly and trebly surrounded with ramparts of Athanasian Creeds and Thirty-nine Articles? Has it lost all belief in the Presence of the purifying and inspiring power of the Spirit of Truth?"

self-change in response to new environment. "We all are changed by still degrees, all but the basis of the soul" and are "rising on stepping-stones of our dead selves to higher things." Yet in every case, the higher new grows out of the old, is the natural development of the old, preserves and carries on all its vital power, merely discarding whatever elements it has outgrown. A mollusc does not die when it casts its old shell for a better new one, and the Faith is not going to suffer, but become all the more full of vitality, if we discard its old shell for one more beautiful and larger and truer and more adapted to protect it and us from the hostile forces of the world.

The form or wording of a dogma, like the words of all living tongues, begins to grow old from the day of its birth. Words are counters to represent actual ideas, and when that for which the word stands is no more ours, we have no further use for its symbol. So it is that, in every living language, many old words have either dropped out of use altogether or acquired an entirely new meaning, while we have had to coin several new ones to express new ideas. To a modern Englishman, much of our old literature might as well be written in a foreign language, for it requires a glossary and learned commentary to explain it.

So it is with old dogmas. Their wording belongs to their generation, and the metaphysics and philosophy of Patristic Theology are far removed from the ideas and culture of to-day. Thought has travelled far since then, and we have gone through two or three intellectual evolutions which have made our outlook widely different. These dogmas expressed eternal truths in the words and ideas of their generation. We must translate the dogmas into our own living words and ideas if we would retain their true meaning for us.

Consciously or unconsciously, we all put our own meaning on these old dogmas. Just as we still use the old expression 'the sun sets,' so we use the old words of our grandfathers' creeds, but to few of us do they mean exactly what they meant to them. We no longer give a geographical interpretation to such articles as: "He descended into hell; He ascended into heaven; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead." A creed is recited to-day in Church by twenty different people, and may mean twenty different things to them according to their respective culture. Even to the same individual it speaks differently at different stages of his mental and spiritual growth. Cowper's pious peasant woman, the man in the street, the educated layman, the theologian, the

philosopher use the same Apostles' Creed, and practically the only words to which they give precisely the same meaning are 'the,' 'and,' and 'of.' Yet for each of them, 'God,' 'Jesus Christ,' 'Holy Spirit' are real living forces influencing their mind and heart.

'Revise our creeds,' is one of the popular cries to-day. God forbid! These old creed-makers wrought better than they knew. They may not have formulated, signed, sealed and delivered Articles of Faith for all time, but in the Nicene Creed they came so near it that modern thought endorses its every word, with the possible excision of two words.[1] It is the most inspired piece of writing outside the Bible. The Apostles' Creed, with its exquisitely suggestive word-pictures, may not be quite on the same level, but it is the people's creed and voices their beliefs.

> "Which he may say who binds the sheaf,
> Or builds the house, or digs the grave,
> Or those wild eyes that watch the wave
> In roarings round the coral reef."

The truth of a belief may not depend on its appeal to all sorts and conditions of men, but its incapacity so to do goes dead against any creed. "To the

[1] 'Virgin,' 'third.'

poor the gospel is preached," has ever been the note of Christianity.

Indeed, this is the great charm of our two creeds. They *are* real 'symbols,' suggesting to each man, in their word-pictures, what he has eyes to see. Couched in elastic Biblical terms understandable in a coarser or a finer way, more sensuously or more spiritually, they appeal equally to scholar and peasant. All the better! Creeds are there to edify the whole Church, and it comprises both 'full-grown men' and 'babes,' and the language of its worship should be intelligible to the 'babes' as well as the 'men.' In setting the magnificent Nicene Creed side by side with the simpler Apostles' Creed, the Church is exactly copying the New Testament. All New Testament writers alike held 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' but each cast it in his own mould of thought.[1] For instance, 'S. John,' S. Paul, and 'Hebrews' hold the dogma of the Divinity of Christ equally with S. Matthew and S. Luke. But the former represent it to themselves under the symbol of the Incarnate Word or Indwelling Logos, while the two simpler-minded Synoptics

[1] Cf. Professor P. Gardner: "In the New Testament we have ideas and phrases which embody sides or aspects of spiritual experience, without much care to fit these phrases into any regular or articulated scheme of thought, and therefore a great variety of intellectual views about the heavenly Christ."

can only grasp it under the form of an Immaculate Conception or Virgin-Birth. Similarly the Synoptics, and S. Paul at one period of his life, preached the resurrection *of the body*, while S. Paul in 2 Corinthians v. has learnt to separate the essence of the resurrection from its *bodily* form.

The creeds are on right and true lines in their present elastic Biblical form. Thus do they best suit the needs of all sorts and conditions of men, edify the whole Church, safeguard its continuity, and wound no susceptible souls as would a creed framed to satisfy our sense of philosophic accuracy. As Tyrrell used to say: "We want no religion of intellectualism that buries its head in the clouds of the Abstract and substitutes the Absolute for the Babe of Bethlehem or the Man of Calvary." An accurately defined intellectual creed would rob worship of all warmth and beauty, and probably rob simple souls of their faith.

Serapion, a monk, one day learnt from two friends, Paphnutius a priest and Photinus a deacon, that it was childish to view God as a magnified man, for "God is a Spirit." Enlightened Serapion at once thanked God on his knees for thus opening his eyes to His true glory. But even as he prayed, Serapion made the appalling discovery that the dear form of his visible God, to Whom he had always been in the

habit of praying, was no longer there. Bursting into tears, and with his face buried in the ground, he cried with a loud and bitter cry: "Woe is me! they have taken away my God, and I have Him no longer to speak to me or hear me!"

We are all of us more or less Serapions. The Religion of the Spirit is a beautiful ideal; it is Christ's own. But for us ordinary men the time is not yet when "Neither in Jerusalem nor in Gerizim shall men worship . . . for God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." To take a case in point. Mysticism is the ideal of the true religious life. All true prophets and seers are mystics, so God-possessed and rapt in Him that literally they can say: "I live, yet not I, but God liveth in me: it is God that worketh in me both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Their at-one-ness with God is such that, in the full self-surrender of their pure and loving hearts to His, they think as He thinks, feel as He feels, will as He wills, and almost enter into His inner counsels. As we see by the antagonism of Christ and Paul and Old Testament prophets to the forms and ceremonies of traditional ecclesiasticism, they are so full of God's inner light that they can discard all the fetters and rites of outward religion as hindrances and not helps. All doctrines and outward observances which

seem to the ordinary believer to be essential to religion are, to the true mystic, externals which pale before the inner light of the revelations of God, even as do stars before the rising sun. The mystic does not condemn them in others, but he himself needs them not and never gives them a thought. The fulness, energy and fire of his inner religious life satisfies all his spiritual needs.

But mysticism has to pay the price of this divine soul-rapture. Man is not all feeling or all imagination, but reason as well, and even mystics find that practical reason cannot be ignored. *Practical* reason, we say, for depth of thought is never lacking in mysticism. The inspired feelings, heart-thoughts, and visions of this deepest and most living form of piety are at all times most closely allied to the profoundest thoughts of other people.[1] The religious spirit of the mystic in the fresh ecstasy and white-heat of rapt feeling is so absorbed in it that it scorns to bring forth the rich treasures of religious strength, freedom, and truth into the clear dry light of reflection and thought, far less give them utterance in outward forms. It discards symbols and rites and creeds, but only to find they are needed all the same.[2] The

[1] Cf. "Let others reason, and welcome; 'tis we musicians know."

[2] Thought without form does not rouse the emotions; form without thought is idolatry, and fatal to growth; emotion without thought has no abiding force. Hence Religion wants all three.

mystic ardour cools, days come when even mystics are not "caught into the paradise of the third heaven and hear and see unspeakable things." *Then* even a Paul and a Luther feel the need of some form in which their feeling may find utterance. Vague and fluid feeling and fancy will no longer do, and the mystic has to find self-expression and support in dogma, even though its inadequacy repels him. He is forced to accept or create dogma, if his soul is to have an anchor and ride the rough seas of life in safety. Dogma repels him, yet he cannot do without it. Some thought-out convictions he must have. Just because his feeling is so warm, his inspiration so rich, his intuition so true, they must find some self-expression. If he seriously thinks out his heart-experience, then his imagination, fired by transcendent feeling and curbed by thought, gives us word-picture dogmas that walk and talk with us and inspire us. If, however, the mystic, self-centred in feeling, curbs thought and reflection, nature exacts the full penalty for the slight. Feeling and fancy run riot, and we get that fantastic degenerate mysticism which has brought the real into bad repute.

As with dogma, so with religious rites. Acted deeds are as essential to a well-balanced religion as creeds. It is impossible long to preserve the warm

glow of heart unless you give it full scope in outward action. Check its natural outlet, and the inner feeling will die of atrophy. Indeed, some eminent psychologists go so far as to assert that feeling is the child of action. Be this as it may, the influence of outward acts on inner feelings is very deep. From the outset, rites have formed an essential part of Religion, and Christ sets His seal to them both by precept and example. He knelt in prayer, fasted, went to Temple and Synagogue to worship, instituted Sacraments. Call rites, if you will, the 'accident' of Religion, even as you may call outward and visible tokens of love the accident of affection, yet neither Religion nor affection can thrive without them. Rites *are* means of grace, channels through which God's Spirit influences our spirit.

Rites and all outward observances have undoubtedly their danger and abuse, as Pharisaism old and new proves. We all remember Pascal's words: "Take holy water and have masses said; quite naturally that will enable you to believe. and will blunt your wit." To put it in modern English: Go regularly to Church and Altar, and it may tend to hypnotise you into the belief that these holy rites work by magic. True, yet we do not condemn food and drink because there are gluttons and drunkards, nor education because it

may produce clever villains, nor Religion because of its Pharisees.

. . . . . .

A few words on Authority and Private Judgment in Religion. Our knowledge comes to us in two ways. We get it at first hand for ourselves by the light of reason and private judgment, or at second hand on the authority of others. The first method gives us personal convictions, the second borrowed opinions. If we know our borrowed opinions to be the reasoned-out, tested, and verified work of experts, this is a strong presumption in their favour and they can reasonably rank as convictions. If we suspect our authority of bias or any other mental disqualification for arriving at the truth, we must also suspect its facts and suspend our judgment.

Authority may be reasonable or coercive, educational or thought-throttling. It is reasonable when it courts all inquiry into its claims to be believed and is ready to establish them whenever called upon by competent judges; coercive, when it asserts its right to be believed, yet resents all investigations into its credentials and dogmatises without any reasons given. Reasonable authority tells you: Take on trust my statements for the present till you are in a position to test and verify them for yourself; when that time comes, I shall give

you full reasons and proofs. Reasonable authority thus places man in a right attitude for forming a judgment, and helps him to form it so as to convert his borrowed opinions into reasoned-out personal convictions. Coercive authority tells you: Do as I say, and believe what I say, or it will be the worse for you.[1] It speaks with the voice of a despot to a slave, and is naturally thought-throttling.

In religion, as elsewhere, authority is essential. Religious authority comes to me and says: Believe what I tell you, for I represent the collective experience and wisdom of myriads of holy men for thousands of years. In me and my tradition you have the heritage of ages, the treasure-house of all the spiritual acquisitions of the past. You cannot possibly do without me.

The plea is strong, nay, unanswerable, and I know it. In my character and spiritual life, I am as much the child of thousands of generations behind me as I am in mind and body. Not only so, I am born into the world a member of a family, a clan, a nation, a Church. The part I myself contribute to my own making bodily or spiritually is infinitesimal. Nine-tenths of what I am is due to

[1] *e.g.* Whosoever will be saved, must believe thus and thus as the Church tells him, or without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

heredity and to the atmosphere of the time and place into which I am born. Even my beliefs, like my features, are very much a matter of geography. I cannot cut myself quite loose from my past or my fellows, and would not if I could. Why should I? The collective wisdom and experience of the past is much richer and wiser than mine. Why should I renounce the benefits it has to offer me, by cutting myself off from an inheritance by which I have so largely benefited and shall continue to profit?

None the less, even if the past and my fellows claim nine-tenths of me, one-tenth is my very own, and, as an individual self-conscious spirit, I have rights of my own. I have no wish to destroy by my self-assertion the bond linking me to my past and to the solidarity of mankind, but I claim the right to think for myself, "to try all things and hold fast that which is good," and to be myself. The schooling I have received at the feet of the 'collective wisdom and experience of the past' has developed my personality, and the stronger it grows, the more it recognises its duty to heed the promptings of conscience and reason, to be a law to itself and not accept on bare authority opinions which it cannot convert into personal convictions. Like all good teachers, religious authority has

taught me to reason out things for myself, and to see that tradition has indeed brought with it from the past much that is good and true and eternal, but also much that is the reverse. My one problem in life henceforth is to "individualise in myself the faith of my fathers while freeing it from all that was erroneous in that faith, to socialise my personal faith by freeing it from all egotism and gaining for it an ever clearer consciousness of being rooted in the past and linked with the faith of my fellows."[1]

[1] *i.e.* We must test the authority of the Church, and yet, if we are wise, we shall suspect our conclusion and test it over and over again if it does not agree with that of authority. The old rule is wise and good, *mutatis mutandis*, "Beware of the method that is popular, beware still more of the results that are not popular."

CHAPTER IX

PHILOSOPHY'S LIVING PERSONAL GOD—FATHER, SON, AND HOLY GHOST

IN these few last pages we can only glance superficially and in the broadest outline at Personality in God.

If our cosmological, teleological and ontological sketch has any truth in it, then Nature, Man, God are one organic whole, and God is the source, soul and meaning of it. From all eternity Man and Nature were implicitly in God. What we call Creation was not a contigent or arbitrary act of God at a given moment in finite time, but is an eternal process, the essential outcome of the outgoing Love of God the Infinite Spirit, a moral necessity. Nature, as the thought and will of God made visible to our senses, is essentially spiritual and reveals His character. Man, spirit of God's Spirit, His image, is a pale copy, a tiny reproduction, a partial incarnation of Him.

Now this conception of God as Infinite Spirit, and

of God, Nature, and Man as one organic whole, at once safeguards us from the Scylla of Deism and the Charybdis of Pantheism. It reveals a God Who is simultaneously and eternally Transcendent in the glory of His Being, the depth of His counsels, the unsearchable riches of His love, yet Immanent in Nature and most of all in the heart of man, who is of one nature with God, from Whom he comes and to Whom he returns. The Immanence of God, on which undue stress is laid to-day, is absolutely meaningless apart from His Transcendence; combined, the two explain everything.

Let us clear the ground by briefly explaining what we mean by Pantheism, Deism, Immanence and Transcendence.

Pantheism confounds Nature with God and whittles down Nature, Man, God to a blank colourless identity. God becomes merely a fine name for the universe, since He has no existence apart from it, just as materialism makes mind merely a fine name for brain-action. According to Pantheism, God is the universal world-soul, world-reason, world-life of which you and I are transient manifestations, modes, or forms. Out of Him all individual forms of existence are constantly emerging and, like waves upon the ocean, as constantly sinking back again and being absorbed by Him Who is the

common stream of universal life. "All is God and God is all, for God alone is, and apart from Him is nothing," is a great truth in one sense, and a great falsehood in another; for Pantheism gives us a non-moral God, sacrifices man's individuality and responsibility, and the identification of God with the cosmic principle absolutely fails to account for conscience or the sense of sin. Pantheism is too thin, a vague abstraction that jumbles up animate and inanimate, moral and non-moral, earthquakes and brotherly love, righteousness and greed into one filmy idea void of all quickening vitality.

Deism runs to the opposite extreme. It banishes God from His universe, makes Him dwell as a transcendent Being in some heavenly sphere, quite outside and above man and Nature, in a state of splendid isolation. True, He created the world and set it going by the fiat of His arbitrary Will, but from that moment let it go by itself. In opposition to Atheism, Deism holds that there is a God, and in opposition to Pantheism it holds that God is distinct from the world; but it differs from Theism in maintaining that God is separate from the world, which He merely endowed with self-sustaining and self-acting powers and then abandoned to itself.

The God of Pantheism is infinitely preferable to such a God as that. The immanent God of Pantheism at any rate assures man of his real and intimate union with the source of his own and of the universal life, and certainly does not banish God from His universe. Indeed, in a feeble and inadequate way, it tries to do what S. John's Logos and the Divine Incarnation achieve; it reveals to man his at-one-ness with God and welds Nature, Man, God into a rational organic whole. It is this profound idea that makes Pantheism so attractive. "In Him we (and all things) live, move and have our being," not only meets man's craving for absolute union with God, it also satisfies man's craving to see in the universe a rational organic unity, the outcome of one and only one principle or world-soul from which all-that-is proceeds.

Deism is the outcome of a rationalism which makes intellect the measure of all things in heaven and earth and passes everything through the sieve of a narrow formal logic. As we have already seen, the bed-rock axiom of logic is 'a thing cannot be itself and other than itself at the same time.' Therefore God, Nature, and Man are viewed, like material objects, as so many independent and mutually exclusive entities existing side by side, each isolated from the other in its own hard in-

dividuality, or only outwardly and mechanically related. Their organic unity becomes impossible in such a scheme as this. Pantheism, on the other hand, is the universe personified. Both conceptions are essentially one-sided, yet both have the value of their half-truths. They are right in what they affirm, wrong in what they deny. Deism rightly gives us a transcendent personal God, yet it defeats its own aim and stultifies its own assertion by placing Nature and Man outside Him. It does not see that this limits His all-embracing Nature and makes Him one whole among many. He is a Finite God and no longer 'all in all.' Pantheism rightly gives us an immanent God Who *is* 'all in all,' but at too great a price both to God and man. While poetically personifying God, it really robs Him of all personality and blots out man's individuality altogether. It can only preserve the absoluteness of God by removing all clear distinctions till nothing remains but a blank colourless abstraction, a monotonous uniformity, a vague cosmic principle.

We are perfectly ready to say with Pantheism: "God alone is, all is God and God is all, for apart from Him is nothing," to make God the Absolute, but on condition that we do not whittle it down into a pale abstraction. The Absolute must include *all* that is, and it were a strange kind of 'All' that

included in itself the material universe and its forces and not the mind and heart and will of which we ourselves are self-conscious.[1] Shall we possess these, and God the source of all not possess them intrinsically? That were a strange kind of Pantheism or no Pantheism at all. On its own lines, God must include all being, for He is the Absolute Being; all force and life, for He is Absolute Force and Life; all mind, for He is Absolute Spirit; all that is moral and good, for He is the Absolutely Good. In the Absoluteness of God must be the whole truth of the mind as well as of the universe. Such an Absolute is no abstraction and no fiction, but the richest, the most inclusive, the most real of all ideas, the foundation alike of existence and of thought, the source of all goodness and all that is highest.

Again, we are perfectly ready to say with Pantheism: "In Him we move and live and have our being," but only on condition that we do not rob a single soul of its individuality and altogether absorb him in God. As we have seen times without number, God the Infinite Spirit does not mean a

[1] It may be urged, "But evil is also here, is it then also in God?" As we have said in Chap. III., evil is an 'accident,' not a 'property' of God's world; and experience proves that there are grades of existence. Already in us the ape and tiger are dying out and germs of higher faculties appearing. Intensification of the higher in us lies before us, intensification of the lower is behind us, and God-attributes must be deduced from the highest in us.

Being Who spreads Himself out and spatially fills the universe to the exclusion of all other spirits, but precisely the reverse. It is a Spirit which finds its very being and life in the being and life of other spirits, without either limiting His own infinitude or their individuality. "I live, yet not I, but God liveth in me," does not absorb me into God, but is the condition of the full self-expression of my true individuality.

We want neither the isolated God of the Deist, nor the all-absorbing God of the Pantheist. Yet we must insist both on the immanence of God, with the Pantheist, and on His transcendence with the Deist, but on truer and deeper principles than either of these schools. Man has instinctively done so all along. Just as true instinct led man to anthropomorphise God and intuitively see that whatever worthy attribute belongs to man, be it of mind or heart or will, its existence in the principle of the universe is thereby admitted and it belongs to the All, or God, so here. A true instinct has prompted the religious consciousness of mankind, in all ages and various climes, to conceive of a God Who somehow dwells in all things and yet somehow is far above them. At one time the religious spirit of man is filled with the sense of the nearness and omnipresence of God: "If I ascend up into heaven,

Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me. Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?" (cf. Rom. x. 6). "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." At another time it is God's Transcendence and His exceeding glory that overflows and well-nigh overwhelms the religious spirit: "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts." "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" "Behold, God is great, and we know Him not." "It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants therefore are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them as a tent to dwell in" (cf. Rom. ix. 17–21).

How can these things be? How can one and the same God be both immanent and transcendent at the same time?—asks a formal logic. We have already answered this question twice and need not dwell on it now. As the personality that makes its home in the body and its members shows, in all organic wholes the unity of the whole is immanent

in all its parts, and yet far transcends any one of them or all of them put together. Both the whole and the parts derive their being from one another and cannot be sundered and yet live. The whole produces the parts, not the parts the whole; they are only its manifestations. It realises itself in them, fulfils itself in their diversity as a 'unity in differences,' the unity not cancelling the distinctions nor the distinctions the unity.

We see the same thing in all great spiritual creations. A piece of music is not an aggregate of sounds, nor is a picture a collection of colours. Each is an organic whole, a unity existing in and by virtue of differences, and differences deriving their very nature and meaning through the unity. The symphony and picture are each the embodiment of one conception and the expression of one mood; so much so that another artist cannot truly complete another's unfinished work. The elements or parts in the piece of music derive all their value and meaning from the master-idea that dwells in them.[1] The particular note makes its joyous or

[1] And just as embodied spirit never manifests the whole of personality, only so much as the body and its faculties can be made to subserve, so of all artistic creations. They exhibit in material form a master-idea, and imperfectly. A symphony does not express the composer's whole conception, and a poet catches glimpses of glories which elude his verse.

pathetic appeal because it is part of a great musical movement. Take it out of the movement and you deprive it of its meaning and beauty; put another note in its place and you may ruin the movement.

In all real organic creations, the universal, the master-idea, the ideal comes first, not last. What is posterior in time is prior in nature; the first is last and the last first. So completely does the ideal in all its completeness govern the whole process that there is not, from the very outset, one note or touch that is not instinct with the power of the whole and prophetic of its fulfilment.

So it is with the organic whole, God, Nature, Man. God is immanent in Nature and man, yet transcends them both. He is the higher unity which at once embraces and explains them both, giving them their place and value by His very immanence in them. He without them cannot be made perfect, yet they without Him could not even exist, far less thrive, for He is their Source, their Soul, their Goal. We are in God, of God, for God, yet He does not absorb us or rob us of our individuality. On the contrary, we are necessary to Him for His full self-expression in and through us, His members; and not till every man sings his note full-throated will the harmony of the service of

God, which is our perfect freedom, be perfect Praise.

. . . . . .

In dealing with the nature of God, we have necessarily spoken in the technical language of philosophy. Can we, still speaking in the language of philosophy, translate its ideas into the warmer speech of Religion and show the God of Philosophy to be a living Personal God, a God Who is the life-breath of the soul, 'closer to us than hands or feet or breathing,' loving us more tenderly than a mother her darling child? The thing can be done, but it needs careful handling and an abler pen. Here, a few suggestions must suffice.

We have seen that, in the face of Conscience' categorical imperative and our insatiable soul-hunger for all knowledge and all goodness, together with our innate standard of excellence dwarfing all our actual mental and moral attainments, philosophy is compelled to assume the being of God as the sole ground and guarantee of this ideal knowledge and goodness. And He is a God so actually and intimately in touch with us that "it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure." It is not we that think true and good thoughts, but God Himself Who thinks them in us, and, as Conscience indicates, wills them in us.

Philosophy emphatically endorses what the speech of Religion says of the work of the Holy Spirit in us. Now a Will which is thus directed to a realisation of all that is highest and most perfect in man, "a stream of tendency not ourselves that makes for righteousness," can hardly be called by any other name than perfect goodness, a Will of goodness. Philosophy may at times speak of the Divine Consciousness as Universal Reason, but she far prefers the term Infinite Spirit. For she regards God as Infinite Truth, Infinite Goodness, Infinite Love, and what are these but attributes of a self-conscious Mind and Will and Heart, *i.e.* a Personality? Mind and will and heart are what we mean by 'spirit,' or to use the more common term, a 'person.'

God is a Spirit or Person. In what sense is God a Person even as we are persons? Can He be spoken of as 'personal' in our human interpretation of the term? Most decidedly, for He alone is all that 'person' connotes, while we are only 'persons by courtesy.'

Of course, it is too plain for words that there are some traits of human personality which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be truly ascribed to God; but they are accidents of true personality, though properties of ours. To begin with, man *is*

a spirit and *has* a body. His present material body is now a property of himself as a finite being living under conditions of time and space, but this fleshly body is almost as much an accident of man as is the house he dwells in. To quote once more M'Taggart's apt simile: "If a man is shut up in a house, the transparency of the windows is an essential condition of his seeing the sky. But it would not be prudent to infer that, if he walked out of the house, he could not see the sky, because there was no longer any glass through which he might see it." So it is of my body. Here on earth, man's self-conscious spirit is pent up in an animal-organism body, and the two are so intimately connected here, that personality has to use the bodily senses and faculties for its self-expression and can only thus express itself in proportion as these develop. But have we any reason to suppose that such a body is essential to the 'self,' and is not S. Paul's idea in 2 Corinthians v. much nearer the mark?

The idea of such a body as ours is necessarily excluded from the Personality of God, and with it much else. My present body influences my 'self' much and continuously, fettering and clogging its self-expression. My mental life is largely dependent on organic changes in my body, while my emotions are profoundly affected by its actual state. In

every way, my personality has, as best it may, to adapt its self-expression to the limitations of the only instrument at its disposal for its self-manifestation. Eternally complete as is the God-Consciousness in us, it cannot give expression to the whole of its knowledge and goodness except in proportion as the faculties of the body develop sufficiently to become its proper vehicle of expression. Even Jesus had to "increase in wisdom, as well as in stature and in favour with God and man"; even He had to discipline His heart and "learn obedience by the things He suffered." — Once more; our material body *localises* us. I am here and not there,[1] conditioned and limited both by time and space in a way impossible to God.

Hence we must at once discard from God's Personality certain attributes which *now* are notes of human personality. We cannot possibly assign to God any of the accidents of Personality, due to its localisation in a material body, *e.g.* development, soul-hunger, sub-consciousness, limitations of time and space, and so forth.

But this elimination of the accidents of Person-

[1] All the same, as telepathy shows, the 'self' can annihilate these local limitations:

> "Star to star vibrates light: so soul to soul
> Strikes through a finer element of her own."

ality does *not* deny, it all the more emphatically affirms the reality of Personality in God. For, surely, the more effectually Personality sheds its limitations and fetters, the more intensely real does it become. Finite personality is ever 'becoming,' as evolution shows. Embryonic in plants and animals, it is far more explicit in self-conscious man. Our "growing in wisdom and in favour with God and man" is in itself an acknowledgment that our personality is in the making, a possibility still unrealised, a promise not yet fulfilled, a personality only so called by courtesy. And just because there is no development in God; because He is not mere possibility, but altogether reality; because He *is*, and does not become; because, to Him, all is an eternal Now and Here; because He is 'all in all,' and there is nothing apart from Him or outside Him conditioning Him,—God is truly Personal, as man is not.

In our analysis of Personality, we saw it to be self-conscious, creative, self-directing, ever one and the same; and Mind, Heart, and Will are its essential faculties. Man, a spirit or person, thinks and feels and wills. Truth, Love, Goodness are the ideals after which he strains and strives in his conditioned personal development.

Are Truth, Love, Goodness in God also?

Assuredly! Philosophy, as we have seen, is compelled to assume God as the ground and guarantee of these ideals in us; only our ideals are God's reals.

Our conditioned mind seeks Truth, or the perfect accord of our thought with reality as it is in itself. God is Perfect Truth, for His Mind is absolutely unconditioned; in Him is no darkness or obscurity at all. All that is is one scheme, and He is the soul and meaning of it; so it is in His eyes one perfectly harmonious and luminous organic whole. Again, man's conditioned will seeks the good, the perfect accord of what is with what ought to be, the transfiguring of self-will into the universal Will. God is Perfect Goodness; He has no lower self to curb, and His Self-Will *is* the universal Will. Moreover, His Good Will ever realises all its ends, for it has all the conditions of its activity in itself. It is not dependent on any motives outside itself, so, in God, there is perfect accord between what is and what ought to be. Once more, the heart of man seeks that joy and peace which only comes to him who achieves the promise of his being, who fully expresses his true self by going out of self in love to others to find in them his own perfect self-expression. This outgoing Love, blessing itself in blessing others and finding its life in losing it, is the flower of feeling; it is heart raised to its highest power. Now,

as we have so often said, to call God Infinite Spirit is to call Him Infinite and Absolute Love, for to go out of self to others in self-emptying love is the note and essence of 'spirit.' 'God is Love' is *the* definition of God.

God, then, is All-Wise, All-Good, All-Love; Perfect Truth, Perfect Goodness, Perfect Love, *i.e.* He is Mind + Will + Heart. If this is not what we mean by Personality, then I do not know what the term means. And all the other notes of true Personality flow from God's Truth, Goodness and Love. As true, He thinks; as good, He wills; as loving, He feels; and a Being Who thinks, wills and feels is and must be self-conscious. God is ever one and the same, for Philosophy fully endorses Religion's words: "with Whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning; the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Creative we also know Him to be, for He is the Source and Goal of all that is. Now if God is self-conscious, creative, self-directing, ever one and the same, the Infinite Spirit of Truth (Mind), Goodness (Will), and Love (Heart), then He is essentially a Personal God.

How are we to reconcile the Righteousness of God with His love? For the God of Truth, Goodness, Love, Whom Philosophy proclaims, *is* a Righteous

Holy God. In His Presence, Duty acquires a new grandeur, for in becoming the service of a God of Love it becomes at once more binding and more free. And Sin acquires a deeper taint, because it is such an awful wrong done to a love more deep and tender than a mother's. Yet how are we to reconcile God's Love with His Righteousness, for this Perfect God can hardly wink at our evil? But does not Righteousness seem to contradict Love? Does it not carry with it the severity of a Judge inflicting suffering on a criminal as a penalty for wrongness of character and conduct? How, then, can Righteousness and Love go hand in hand?

Is the contradiction between the two really there? Indeed, how can Righteousness and Love *not* go hand in hand? The two are inconceivable apart, and for the following reasons:—

What kind of a love is God's? What is perfect love? Love, to be perfect, must be pure love that never changes. What would we think of a mother whose love to her child was a perishable affection that could be earned by merit in her child, and instantly lost by that child's selfish actions or character? True love must be the love of the Father in the Prodigal-Son story, a love which hates the evil in the child as ruinous to its welfare, but loves the child all the more because it needs that

undying love as never before. The love we expect in God, and must have from Him, is that so well depicted by S. Paul: "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers (*i.e.* neither angels nor demons[1]), nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God." It must be an unchangeable Love, whose "Sun riseth on the evil and on the good, on the just and on the unjust." Aye, there must be as much of the Love of God to souls in hell[2] as for those in heaven, only the latter are receptive of it, while the former seal their hearts hermetically against it all they can.

A God of Love can never cease to love His darling children. Terribly as our sin and wilful estrangement from God hurts us, it hurts God's Heart still more. So long as it lasts, it is an open sore, an everlasting sorrow in His loving Heart. For Him to accept the loss of our love were to make God's Love less real than that of a mother to her wayward child. God annihilate that wayward child, or condemn him to the hell of popular superstition! Away with the bare thought as blasphemy against God! That were not only a slur against God's wisdom and

[1] See *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, i. 617a.

[2] Of course, we know hell is a state and not a place.

power, compelling God to confess that man's evil was stronger than His good and making Him end what He could not mend, but, more and worse than this, such a God would be below the level of many a human being.

Somehow, God must be faithful to His Love, win that child back, yet wean him from his sin at the same time. Yes, but how? How does a loving mother win back her wayward child? By a warm undying love that clings to him through cloud and sunshine, be his sin and disgrace what they may, yet silently appeals to him to be a better man by all that is highest and holiest in human experience, the sight of what his evil deeds mean in sorrow and suffering to her who loves him more than her own soul. That true mother weans her child from his evil ways and wins back his love, makes him 'come to himself,' by influencing him suasively from within his own heart. And that is ever God's way. Look at the Cross and its appeal of suffering Love!

This is the unique revelation of God we owe to Jesus, and the secret of His hold on the universal heart of mankind. The Love of God, the forgiveness of our sins, was not effected by Jesus' Life and Death, but it was revealed by Him. The purpose of His Life was not only to show men with what love they were loved by Himself, but with what love

they were loved by God. "I have declared unto them Thy name, and will declare it; that the Love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them." It was this truth of our heavenly Father's love which Jesus taught and lived, and established and sealed by His Death. It was this truth thus lived that gave Jesus the place and the power which are all His own in the history of mankind. So intense was Jesus' consciousness of His Sonship,[1] so uniquely was His Will at one with God's Will, so absolutely did He realise in His Life the ideal of Son of God, that in His Presence we catch His Spirit and share His Faith. He literally inspires us with His own Spirit and becomes to us a living, gracious, mighty indwelling Presence, Whose Love not only constrains us, but whose power also strengthens us to follow afar off in His steps. With the Life of Jesus, a new spiritual force dawned on the world, as momentous as the dawning of self-consciousness or of the moral sense in evolution;[2] a force so intense that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at the first Whitsuntide, as word-pictured in Acts, only

[1] He certainly felt that He stood alone in His mission, and that His unique revelation had come to Him with a fulness and power as to no other.

[2] Christ's Advent undoubtedly marks the phenomenon of a gigantic birth, a fierce ebullition of new life, the outpouring of a mighty tide of spiritual life upon the world, the beginning of a new series of psychic and vital phenomena.

faintly represents it, for this outpouring of Christ's Spirit has been growing in volume ever since.

But the Love of God, a Love which puts man to shame and at the same time forgives, was there before Jesus revealed it. Why did Jesus' revelation of God's Fatherly Love and man's divine sonship find such an immediate echo in man's heart? Because He seized upon with the entire strength of His Personality, and brought the full force of His character and life to bear upon, ideal truths which were "in the air," but had not yet become active working forces in the world. The Fatherhood of God, the forgiveness of sins, the divinity of man, were not entirely new revelations, but it was Jesus Who first gave them life and efficacy by living them out, and in His own Person made them active powers in man's life. His 'Prodigal Son' Gospel,—and it is the whole Gospel of Christ in a nutshell,—found an immediate echo in men's hearts, because it was what all men in their heart of hearts were longing to say. It was a Gospel of glad tidings, joyful unto men as the dawning of the day from night, as the awakening from death unto life,—and the voice of their own hearts told them it was true. He realised and visualised the ideal law of their spiritual being, written in their hearts, after which they had all the while been straining.

It was Jesus' own Heart that revealed to Him the Love of God, and God had written it in every human heart, only the eyes of their soul were holden and they read it not.

Why is it that on doing wrong we are ashamed and feel, so long as there is a particle of feeling left in us, the same tearful and broken-hearted sorrow which overwhelms us on hurting a devoted mother? Why, on doing right, do we enjoy the same peace and joy of heart which follows on our receiving praise from a father whom we love and respect? Why do even the most unlikely and unlovely of us men so admire acts of self-sacrificing goodness and heroism and, in our inmost hearts, long to go out of self and do likewise? Why, when we fall below ourselves, are we so conscious of a searching eye that sees right through us in the solitude, the darkness, the hidden chambers of our heart? Whose is the accusing Voice we hear at such moments in the innermost sanctuary of our Conscience?

To all these questions there is but one intelligible answer. It is God's own good and loving Spirit actively at work, influencing us within our own hearts, lovingly refusing to leave us in our sin or allow us to be happy in it, resolved to wean us from it, to save us from our evil which separates us from our Father and our own best good. For the time

being we are sick and in need; the pain we feel is our heart-cry to God our Father. We are seeking Him, because He has already sought and found us.

God's Love that will not let us go,—this is the meaning of our shame, our remorse, our terror, our dis-ease. A God of Love creates it and heals it. His sitting in judgment on us, nay, rather, His making us sit in judgment on ourselves, at the bar of our Conscience, is only another aspect of His undying Love that will not let us go.

Now can we see how "mercy and truth are met together, Righteousness and [Love] have kissed each other"? As any true father or mother well knows, the purer the love, the more intense is the jealousy of any spot or blot in the one beloved. This is precisely why a true father's attitude towards a wayward child is more severe than a judge's in a law-court. The father sees in his child's evil, not the mere breaking of a law, but the coming ruin of his darling's character and life. By love or fear, he must wean him from his evil, win him back to his true self, save his soul alive. This is what we mean by God's Righteousness. Far from contradicting God's love, it is its flower.

Again we say, this is the God of Love Jesus revealed in His own Person to men, and they saw

God, now and henceforth, in a light in which they had never seen Him before. In Jesus' perfect human life of outgoing, self-sacrificing, saving love, a life wholly spent in the selfless loving service of others, a life poured out to win men to be their own true selves, a life finding its true glory in self-emptying and sacrifice,—Jesus declared the Fatherhood and Love of God, and men saw, in Jesus, God actually present in their midst. No wonder! This new conception of God came from God Himself, but it was received through Christ, and, but for its perfect incarnation in Jesus' own Person and Life, it would not thus have won its way into men's hearts and burst upon the world as a mighty spiritual power. Well might a Paul exclaim: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," and a Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." This was their heart-conviction, because of the effect Jesus had produced upon them. He had done for them, and was to them, what only God could do or be. In His own Person, He had revealed God to man as He had never been known before and never could have been known but for our Lord's own Life. He had given man a new belief in God, the purest and highest conception of Him that has ever entered the heart of man, a conception never approached

before and not yet grasped to-day; but, far more than this, He had lived out before men's eyes His own conception of the Father. No wonder they saw "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." They had not a shadow of a doubt but that He was God.[1] On this point, all the writers of the New Testament are at one.

Never again could His Apostles and disciples think of God except in terms of Jesus and His Love. No longer and never again could they think of God as merely Transcendent in His majesty. True, ideas of God borrowed from Judaic Deism, and inconsistent with the Fatherhood of God as revealed by and in Jesus, remained in His disciples' minds to obscure and distort our Lord's revelation of the Father, and they remain to this day.[2] But, after men had been with Jesus, God was now for them above all the Father of the prodigal, the Shepherd seeking the lost sheep and unable to rest till He has found it. More than this, the experience of their own hearts told them how true it all was.[3]

[1] But for this conviction, the Christian Religion would hardly have established its position as it has done.

[2] *e.g.*, The idea that man is vile and God a consuming fire; the idea that God is the Potter and man His clay; the idea that this loving Father's wrath must be appeased by sacrifice, etc.

[3] Cf. Prof. Bacon: "Just because it is the simplest, purest expression of the truth as revealed in the pure in heart, axiomatic once formulated, though but a vague instinct of the soul until full

And Jesus not only revealed the Fatherhood of God. In His own Person He revealed and actualised man's capacity to become sons of God, thus becoming "the First-born of many brethren." As E. Caird truly says: "The basis of the thought of Jesus is that man is not merely the creature, but the son of God. This sonship Jesus, as the Messiah, claims for Himself, that He may claim it for man." He extinguished for ever that Deism which draws a hard-and-fast line between the nature of God and man, and showed that God and humanity are essentially at one, for man is "in the image and likeness of God." Godhead, which had been of doubtful reality and often of a questionable character before, became henceforth the most real of realities. Manhood acquired a new value. It is precisely because, as E. Caird says, 'Jesus claims God-Sonship for Himself, that He may claim it for all men,' that His Gospel is of such unparalleled sublimity. Now that God is on our side, we feel that sorrow, evil, death cannot overwhelm us. Whatever cup of bitterness God may put to our lips, we can now drink it to the lees, for it turns into the cup of victory and joy, filled with the waters of eternal life, even as did Jesus' Cup at Gethsemane.

expression has come to it through a true Son of God, it remains eternally self-verified to every man that hears His word."

In Jesus, Son of Man, God and man meet. Here Philosophy and Christ's Religion are absolutely at one. If God and man are both personal, they are one in nature, and neither God nor man needs *essential* change to be at one.[1] Even Principal Garvie writes: "God as personal, as moral perfection, as truth and grace, is the pattern after which man is made. Here there is not contrast, but oneness between man and God. God is then expressible and communicable in manhood."

Yet here is our traditional Christology still insisting on the presence of two distinct natures, the human and the divine, side by side in one Christ, a duality of nature the contradictory attributes of which theologians attempt by many ingenious expedients to reconcile, and ignominiously fail. As has been well said: "The Athanasian Creed is a barricade of contradictions piled up to prevent the spirit of Christian philosophy from wandering into regions where it might lose its way."

You cannot divorce human from divine personality. It is one seamless whole. There is no breach of continuity, no gap, between the one and the other, any more than there is between amœba and man. The union of God and man in Jesus Christ

[1] Cf. Athanasius: 'God became man that men might become gods.'

is not the impossible miracle commonly imagined. God is not less God because we are spirit of His Spirit, partial incarnations of Him; while the ideal of human personality is to realise in itself what is eternal reality in God, even as Jesus has done it. Jesus, in so doing, has become not less, but more absolutely, perfect man. As Canon Scott Holland puts it: "He is the only Man Who has ever been wholly man; the only Man Who has ever carried manhood up into its own fulness of consummation; the only Man Who has made manifest all that man can ever be; the only Man Who has summed up in Himself the secret of that Sonship which is the impulse under which humanity for ever moves forward, and the final goal towards which its hope is set."

It is only in terms of personality that we shall ever so conceive of the Incarnation as neither to deny the true humanity nor obscure the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of one thing we may be sure, that any doctrine which draws a hard-and-fast line between man and Christ, Christ and God, man and God, is fundamentally at variance with the Gospel of Christ and hostile to its best interests. Son of Man and Son of God Jesus undoubtedly is, but in the sense implied by Canon Scott Holland's words. Draw a hard-and-fast line between man and Christ, place Him on God's side, one with God in nature,

and men not in a line with God, and see what happens. Instantaneously, Jesus ceases to be of any worth to me as an Example. The chasm between us is too vast and unbridgeable; as great as, nay, greater than that which separates man from animals. Evolution shows animals can pass into men, but, if Jesus is on God's side and I am not, I can never evolve into Christ-likeness. The man Jesus Whom the New Testament represents as 'in all things made like unto His brethren,' is only a Docetic brother, as wide apart as the poles from me because of a 'divine spirit or nature' in Him which is not in me. Of what value, then, can He possibly be to me?

This is *not* Christ's own teaching; and, reverent as their motives undoubtedly are, men do harm and not good when they refuse to ascribe to the divine Christ the true manhood which is His.

. . . . . .

We have spoken of the Father and the Son. What has Philosophy to say of the Holy Spirit? Much every way, and this above all, that it is as the Spirit that we know God, if at all; and for this reason. We have seen that man's heart, or personality, is the one gateway through which all our knowledge,—be it of Nature, man, or God,—must pass; for our thoughts and feelings are our only first-hand facts; all else is inference. Hence, if we

are to know God at all, it must be through a heart-experience.

How do we get this heart-experience? We have seen that it is itself the work of the Spirit. "It is He that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure." The law in our hearts, which makes us strain after all Truth and Goodness, is the handwriting of the God in us. It is God the Spirit's own Voice calling and drawing me unto Himself, and I must obey that call or my true self is stunted. Each time I consciously and freely identify myself with the God within me and His Law in my heart, I not only identify myself with my true self-expression but prostrate myself before God, even though I may not yet know God in the traditional sense of the word. Avowedly or not, I am a religious man.

Just because there is a God in us all and we are 'temples of the Holy Ghost,' there is not a single man born into the world upon whose heart the Spirit's energy does not work and the Spirit's Light enlighten his darkness, though there are thousands who do not acknowledge God. When palæolithic man, in the presence of thunder and forest-dangers, felt a thrill evoking a sigh which was the birth of prayer, it was the Spirit's work. So it is with every experience in ourselves awakening us to higher ideals

and aspirations, a broader charity, a clearer outlook upon life. This awakening of the soul "from its dead self to higher things" is wrought in no two of us alike, and the resultant change of heart may be gradual or instantaneous. But whatever its cause, the man emerges from it a new man, "born again," through finding his spirit responsive to a greater Spirit which, without his being aware of it, wraps him round. God above us, God in us, God in Nature is all the while calling and drawing us to Himself, thrilling men's hearts. The whole history of Religion is the answer to the question: What means this heart-thrill? And in religious creeds, from the rudest and crudest to Christ's final answer, we have the interpretation of what man has found and known in the experience of his own heart. For God's call, God's Presence, is ever felt in one place only, our own hearts, and all our other religious convictions are built on that inner heart-experience.

So it is that, paradoxical as it sounds, although many men, if asked: "Have ye received the Holy Ghost?" would reply (cf. Acts xix. 2), "We have not so much as heard if there be any Holy Ghost," —it is as God the Spirit only that they really know God. Indeed, the Articles of our Creed, to represent our actual experience, should run in the reverse of their present order. In our personal knowledge

of God, we first know Him as God the Spirit; and, for most of us, it is all but impossible for us to form any true conception of God, as a Person and a Father of Love, without the aid of Him Who has incarnated that Father and His Love and Who actualises and visualises Him for us. It is through Jesus we really know the Father. Our hearts echo His words; "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father, etc."

At any rate, reflective thought clearly tells us it is as the Holy Spirit in our hearts we know God first and most intimately. We may not call Him by that name, or even acknowledge God formally; we may be as unconscious of the action of the Spirit upon us as we are of our life-breath (cf. Jo. iii. 8), and yet our own spirit be responsive to His all the while. Is it any wonder that,—closer as He is to us than hands or feet or breathing, every moment suasively influencing our own hearts,—it is that portion of our creed dealing with the Holy Ghost that finds its truest and best expression?

. . . . . .

At the beginning of this chapter we asked: Can the cold thought of Philosophy be translated into the warmer speech of Religion? That question we have here tried to answer. It will still be urged:

Say what you will, philosophy has no religious creed worthy of the name. A creed strikes direct at the heart and will; philosophy leaves the heart cold and inspires no one to activity of character or life.

Is this true? The Nicene Creed, S. John's Gospel, the theology of Paul and 'Hebrews,' are nothing if not philosophic,[1] yet they are essentially warm and inspiring. So, surely, must be the creed of any philosophy which finds in God the sole ground and guarantee of all our goodness (Conscience), all our knowledge (Reason), and insists on His Immanence in our hearts.

Personally, we have neither the power nor the presumption to draw up in set terms a philosophic Creed, but the following paragraphs, summarising the views propounded in these pages, may hint at the religious principles for which idealist philosophy stands. The wording is rugged, popular, diffuse. We sincerely hope this section will not be torn from its context and quoted in this naked form. Divorced from the supporting arguments of the previous chapters which alone give it a meaning, it would convey a very thin and totally wrong impression.

[1] *i.e.* The Logos doctrine underlying them is philosophy pure and simple, and nothing if not modern.

A PHILOSOPHIC CREED

There is one God Almighty, All-Wise, All-Good, All-Holy; the Source, Life, and Goal of all that is; Life of all life, Light of all light, Soul of every soul.

God is a Spirit; Absolute, Eternal, Infinite.[1] He is a Personal God. Absolute in Reason, He is Perfect Truth, and never errs; Absolute in Will, He is Perfect Goodness, and realises all His ends; Absolute in Heart, He is perfect Love.

Transcendent in glory, He is also Immanent in Nature, which is His expressed Thought and Will; most of all does He indwell in man's heart.

God is our Father; man is His child; all men are brethren, and so indissolubly knit together that "none liveth to himself and none dieth to himself."

Man is of God, in God, for God, spirit of His Spirit, and his soul can find no rest till it rest in God. From God man comes and to Him he returns. Man's soul is as eternal as the God-Soul its source; his individuality can never be destroyed. Imperfect, man is called to perfection; poor, he is heir to the riches of God; naked, God will clothe him with righteousness; far from God, God will transfigure him into His own likeness.

The Holy Spirit of God is the Light that lighteth

[1] *Absolute* = has all the conditions of His own Being in Himself; *Infinite* = all-embracing, contains within Himself all actual and possible modes of being. *Spirit* = Person = Mind + Will + Heart.

every man born into the world, guiding him into all truth and all goodness, suasively influencing his heart and mind and will. The Holy Spirit's Light is ever there, but the eye of the soul is not in all men equally receptive of that Light.

Jesus Christ is Son of Man and Son of God. Essentially one in nature with God and man, Jesus in His own Self realised the at-one-ment of man with God. He is the First-Born among many brethren. In Him dwelleth the grace and truth and love of God bodily. God was in Him reconciling the world unto Himself. Through the Spirit of Jesus, God is drawing all men unto Himself to rise to the fulness of their stature as sons of God. Jesus is our Way, our Truth, our Life.

There is a Holy Catholic Church, a communion of saints, and a baptism of the spirit for the remission of sins.[1]

The universe is one organic whole, spiritual and not material, with God as the soul and meaning of it. Creation, God's self-expression under conditions of time and space, is an eternal process actively going on now. Love Divine is the motive-power

[1] 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.' But, under present finite conditions, we cannot realise the full consciousness of our oneness with God, or the communion of the saints, without a visible Church or the rites and symbolic acts of common religious worship.

behind evolution. The Reign of Law is the Reign of Love. Forces of Nature are God's exercised Will, Laws of Nature are His expressed Mind, and both Will and Mind fulfil the ends of His loving Heart.

Evil is an incident in God's world. Essential to man's well-being, evil is here only to be got rid of by good. The Fall was akin to a Rise. The principle of good is inwoven into the very core of the world-order, which is arranged to conquer and wipe out evil. As eternal as God, and endowed with His strength, good is progressively mastering evil and speeding the coming of God's Kingdom. Through man's self-will came sin into the world, through man spontaneously linking his will with God's Will it is to be driven out. Then God's Kingdom of 'righteousness, peace and joy' will be established.

INDEX[1]

[The pages are frequently given according to their reference value, and not in numerical order.]

'*Above reason*,' 175, 222.
Absolute, the, 251 sq., 281.
Absorption in God, 248, 252, 255.
Agassiz, 7 n.
Age, scepticism of, 1 sq., 24.
All, the, 70, 251.
Altruism, 185 sq., 77, 83, 203.
Amphibia, 39, 46.
Anthropomorphism, 128–30, 108.
Apostles' Creed, 236 sq.
Appetites, their ideal, 165 sqq.
Arius, 231.
Arnold, M., 193.
Articles of Faith, 230 sq., 236 sqq.
Asceticism, 143.
Athanasian Creed, 231, 274, 244, 17, 233 n.
Athanasius, 274.
Augustine, 126, 220 n.
Authority in Religion, 243 sqq.

'*Babes in Christ*,' 237.
Bacon, Professor, 272 n.
Balfour, A. J., 96 n., 119, 129 n., 203, 219.
Bergson, 64 n., 181.
Bible-Criticism, 6, 8, 22.
Bibliolatry, 6, 10, 22.
Birthday of Man, 80 sq., 69, 145.
Brain and mind, 137 sq., 42 sq.
British Association (1913), 1 n., 31 n., 40 n., 44 n., 52 n., 59 n., 60 n., 70 n., 79 n., 85 n., 92 n., 100 n., 119 n., 122 n., 181 n., 191 n.
Brontë, E., 75 n.
Browning, 86 n., 139.
Buchner, Professor L., 99, 115.

Caird, Edw., 273.
Caird, Princ., 33, 208.
Categorical Imperative, 143 sq., 208, 87, 167, 199, 210.
Categories, 108.
Cause and effect, 176 sqq., 179 sq., 109, 37, 51 sq.
Character determines will, 158–183.
Church, function of, 13 sq., 18 sq., 233 n., 9 sq.
'*Cogito ergo sum*,' 126.
Comtism, 200 sq., 216.
Conscience, Chap. VII., 143 sq., 81, 86, 269, 208.
Consciousness, 54, 162, 63, 33, 50, 135, 177, 181.
'*Constancy of results*,' 37, 48, 49 n.
Continuity in evolution, 41, 59, 55, 205.

[1] This Index is topical, not evidential. On all main issues, the evidence is cumulative and to be gauged as a whole. The fragmentary Index-references are quite inadequate and inconclusive *per se*.

Conversion, 166 sq., 278, 169, 163.
Copernicus, 5.
Cosmic process moral, 72, 283, 79, 82, 85, 211.
Creation, 68, 75 sq., 282, 187, 196, 207 n.
Creative evolution, 181 sq., 161, 54 sq.
Creed of philosophy, 281–3.
Creed-revision, 236.
Creeds, 11, 231 sq., 236 sqq.
Creeds and character, 115 sq., 132 n.
Croll, Professor, 50 n., 54 n., 57 n., 113, 176.
Cross, the, 84, 187, 266.

Darwin, C., 6, 53, 60 n.
,, *F.*, 53 n.
David, 158, 160, 165 sqq.
Deism, 249 sqq.
Delusion and illusion, 206.
Descartes, 126.
Design in evolution, 58 sq., 60 n., 62 sq.
Determinism, Chap. VI., 170 sqq.
Dewey, Professor, 58.
Directivity, 48–57, 63, 144, 161, 214.
Divinity of Christ, 274–6, 271 sqq., 282, 208, 212, 68, 71, 237.
Dogma, 224, 226–43, 17, 18 n., 21.
Dual personality, 87, 148, 162.
Dualism, 196 sqq., 116.
'*Duty to God*,' 200 sq.
'*Duty to neighbour*,' 200.

Ecclesiasticism, 231, 10 sq., 243 sq., 95, 213, 9, 12.
Eliot, G., 159.
Environment, 48, 53, 45, 161, 213 sq.
Evil, mystery of, 72 sqq., 283.
Evolution, Chap. II.
External world, 117, 112 sq., 106, 54, 127, 197.
'*Eye of the soul*,' 89, 85.

Facts, objective, 105 sqq., 120.
Faculties, 140 sqq., 137, 162.
Faith, 219.
Fall, the, 68 sq., 80 sq., 283.
Fatherhood of God, 76, 226, 17, 281, 264 sqq.
Feeling in Religion, 220, 224–6, 239 sq., 142.
'*Fellow-workers with God*,' 193 sq., 255, 64 sq.
Force, 50 n., 38, 56, 57 n., 113, 283.
Free-Will, Chap. VI., 78.

Gamaliel, 5.
Gardner, P., 237 n.
Garvie, Princ., 274.
Genesis-myth, 80, 227.
God, 257–83.
,, Father, 76, 226, 17, 281, 264 sqq.
,, Son, 226, 273, 267, 282, 17, 68, 76.
,, Holy Spirit, 276–9, 282.
,, Personal, 258–63, 281.
,, Infinite Spirit, 77, 188 sq.
,, Immanent, 251, 253 sqq., 65 sqq., 71, 281.
,, Transcendent, 251, 253 sqq., 281.
,, Creator, 68, 75 sq., 187, 196, 282, 207 n.
,, Incarnate, 207 n., 274, 68, 208, 71, 76, 192, 250.
God's Kingdom, 283, 193 sq., 201, 150.
,, limitations, 74 sq.
,, love, 264 sqq., 77, 84, 15.
,, mercy, 264 sqq.
,, omnipotence, 74.
,, 'promised rest,' 205.

God's righteousness, 263 sqq.
,, sorrows, 265, 73.
Goethe, 185.
Green, T. H., 162.

Haeckel, 40, 56, 100.
Head-reason, 210.
Heart-experience, 219 sqq., 224 sqq., 16, 13, 90, 277 sq.
Heart-reason, 210.
Hegel, 89.
Hell, 265.
Henslow, Professor, 48.
Higher Criticism, 6, 8, 22.
Historical method, 2.
Holland, Canon Scott, 275.
Holy Spirit, 276 sqq., 281 sq.
Huxley, 36, 43, 53, 88 n., 95.

Ibsen, 89 n.
Idealism, 198, 127.
Ideals, 63, 207 sq., 123 sq., 144 sqq., 149, 162 sqq., 202, 205.
Identity, law of, 184, 188.
Illusion-theory, 202 sqq., 206.
Immanence, 251, 253 sqq., 65 sq.
'*Immortal centre*,' 137–9.
Imperative, categorical, 143 sq., 87.
Incarnation, the, 275, 67 sq., 238.
Indeterminism, 157 sqq., 178, 183.
Individualism, 186, 244.
Inert matter, 35 sq., 47, 179, 184.
Infinite Spirit, 77, 188 sq.
Inner light, 89, 131 sq., 23, 210 sq., 239.
Inorganic Nature, 35–9, 47, 180 sq.
Inspiration, 131 sq., 23, 192, 212, 232, 277.
Intuition, 172, 153, 221.

James, W., 20 n., 90, 124, 154.
James, Ep. of, 25 n.
'*Jekyll and Hyde*,' 87, 89 n., 148.
Jesus, 270–6, 266 sqq., 282.
Jesus, God, 274–6, 271 sqq., 282, 208, 212, 68, 71, 237.
,, Man, 274 sqq., 282, 68, 162.
,, Son, 273, 267, 17, 68, 76.
,, At-onement, 273, 68, 71, 266, 84.
,, Example, 267, 208, 209, 273, 275, 276.
,, 'First-born of many brethren,' 273.
,, Gospel, 266–8, 270 sqq.
,, Incarnation, 68, 275, 237 sq.
,, marks epoch in evolution, 267, 275.
,, optimistic, 168.
,, poetry of, 16, 227–8.
,, Spirit of, 267.
,, Virgin-Birth, 238.
Jesus and Creeds, 11.
'*Jesus or Christ*,' 3 n.
Job, 85.
John, S., 13, 17 n.
Jones, Professor H., 116 n., 132 n., 192 n.
Judgment, private, 243 sqq., 13, 25.
Judgments of existence, 93, 122 sq.
Judgments of value, 94, 122 sq.

Kant, 138, 221.
Kelvin, 57.
Kingdom of God, 283, 193 sq., 201, 150.
Kipling, 134.

Leibnitz, 151.
Life-evolution, 39 sqq., 44 sqq., 62 sq.
Linnæus, 34 n.

Lodge, O. (see also B. A. A.), 28, 40 n., 53 n., 93, 153 n., 154.
Logic's limitations, 184–90.
Lotze, 128.
Love of God, 264 sqq.
Love, outgoing, 77.
Luther, 25 n., 241.

M'Taggart, 15 n., 138.
Man, son of God, 273 sq.
Man's Birthday, 80 sq., 69, 145.
Mansel, 139.
Martineau, 128, 164.
Materialism, 100 sqq., 43, 97 sq., 200 sqq., 196 sq.
Matter, 100–18, 41, 57, 196.
Mercy of God, 264 sqq.
Mind, subconscious, 150–5.
Modernism, 1 sqq.
Monism, 103 sq., 196 sqq., 99, 116.
Moore, Aubrey, 60 n.
Moral personality, 78 sq., 80 sqq., 143.
Mother's love, 264, 266, 270.
Myers, 150 sq., 154.
Mysticism, 239 sq.
Myth, 227.

Natural Religion, 33 sq., 69 sqq.
,, Selection, 52 sq., 46, 203.
Naturalism, 200 sqq.
Nicene Creed, 236 sqq.

Objective facts, 105 sqq., 120.
Obligation, sense of, 145 sqq., 173, 201.
Omnipotence of God, 74.
Organic life, 39 sqq., 180 sq., 48 sq.
,, unity, 103 sq., 107, 184 sq., 255.
Originality of Jesus, 16 n.
'Ought,' 143 sqq., 124, 173.
Owen, Professor, 41.

Pantheism, 248 sqq., 86.
Parables, 227.
Paradoxes, 189, 82, 111, 207.
Pascal, 133, 242.
Patristic theology, 230 sq., 235, 17, 19.
Paul, S., 32, 87, 189, 237 sq., 241, 265, 271.
Pelagius, 231.
Personality in God, Chap. IX.
,, in man, Chap. V.
'Persons by courtesy,' 141 sq., 258 sqq.
Peter's confession, 11, 271.
Pharisaism, 242.
Philosophy, 103, 96.
Philosophy and Religion, Chap. IX.
Photinus, 238.
Plato, 227.
Plotinus, 87.
Poetry, religion's speech, 226 sqq.
Private judgment, 243 sqq.
Prodigal Son, 169 n., 264, 268.
Progressive evolution, 41, 58 sq. 205, 213.
,, revelation, 132, 212, 234.
Proofs in religion, 217–22.
Psychology, Chap. V., 125, 33.
Ptolemaic Creeds, 235.

Rashdall, Dr., 74, 76.
Reason of head, 210.
,, of heart, 210.
Reasoning, its limitations, 219 sqq., 156 n., 123.
Reformation, 18 sqq., 25.
Reign of Law, 35 sqq., 6, 283.
Religion and Theology, Chap. VIII., 15 sqq.
,, of authority, 243 sqq.
,, of the Spirit, 239, 13, 224, 232.
Religious instinct, 213–8.
'*Rest, the promised*,' 205.

Resurrection of body, 238 cf., 259.
Revelation, 131 sq., 23, 232.
Richter, J. P., 151.
Righteousness of God, 263 sqq.
Rites in religion, 241 sqq.
Romanes, 32 n., 217.
Royce, Professor, 207 n., 208.

Sabatier, 18 n., 32 n., 215.
Sacraments, 228, 242, 13.
Salmon, Dr. G., 21.
Schopenhauer, 126.
Science and philosophy, 96 sqq., 103 sq.
Science and Religion, Chaps. I. and IV.
Scientific temper, 1 sqq.
Scott Holland, Canon, 275.
Seeking is finding, 133 n., 149, 277.
Selection, natural, 52 sq., 46, 203.
Self-consciousness, 134 sqq., 145, 81, 65.
Self-dissatisfaction, 146 sqq., 208.
Self-will, 79.
Sensation, 107, 111.
Sense-knowledge, 29, 107–19, 44 n., 57 n., 95, 102.
Serapion, 238 sq.
Short views, 205 sq.
Sidgwick, H., 164.
Sin, 79, 249, 264, 265 sq.
Solidarity, 185–7, 244 sq., 281.
Solipsism, 127.
Sonship of Jesus (see Jesus).
Soul, creative, 181 sq., 50 sq.
Soul-hunger, 146 sqq., 208.
Soul immortality, 281.
Soul-sight, 89 sq., 85.
Spencer, H., 66.
Spirit, 185, 77.
Spirit, Holy, 276 sqq., 281 sq.
Spirit of age, 1 sq.
Spontaneous generation, 40 sq., 56.
Stimuli, 213 sqq., 54, 112.
Subconscious mind, 150 sqq.
Subhuman, 165.
Subjectivity, 128–30, 106 sqq., 111, 117, 200.
Symbolism, 226 sqq., 111 sqq., 118.

Taboo, 201.
Temple, W., 83.
Tennyson, 34 n., 87, 193, 194.
Theology and Religion, Chap. VIII.
Thomas, S., 1, 24.
Thomson, Professor, 29, 64 n., 118.
Times, The, 215 n.
Tradition in Religion, 244, 10.
Transcendence, 251, 253 sqq.
Transition-periods, 24.
Trinity, 17, Chap. IX.
Tyndall, Professor, 44.
Tyrrell, 137 n., 191, 238.

Uniformity of nature, 35 sqq., 58, 108.
Unity in differences, 184–90, 255.
Unrest of soul, 146 sqq., 208.

Vicariousness, 187, 266.
Virgin-Birth, 238.

Waggett, Father, 114.
Westcott, Dr., 5, 20.
Will-centres, 78.
Word-pictures, 226 sqq., 241, 16.
Words as counters, 234, 111, 118.
World-evolution, 35.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR**

THE GOSPELS IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH

(SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co. 6s. net.)

"The reader who wants to know what the Higher Criticism of the sober kind has to say about the Gospels cannot do better than study Mr. Cohu's book. When Mr. Cohu is occupied with critical processes, he is nothing less than admirable. . . . The whole discussion as it is conducted in these pages is a model of what such discussions should be."—*Spectator.*

THROUGH EVOLUTION TO THE LIVING GOD

(SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co. 3s. 6d. net.)

"Mr. Cohu's method is excellently clear. He is gifted with a penetrating insight united to clear expression, and his thoughtful work may claim the merit of facing difficult problems with honest courage."—*Academy.*

"We do not remember to have met an account of modern evolutionary doctrine at once so accurate and so lucid."—*Church Times.*

S. PAUL IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH

(EDW. ARNOLD. 5s. net.)

"Mr. Cohu has given us a scholarly piece of work, full of original thought, with a keen perception of the complex and baffling character of the Apostle. All students of the Pauline Epistles should welcome Mr. Cohu's valuable study, which certainly finds a place among the ablest and most interesting theological works of the year."—*Academy.*

"A fearless and critical exposition of Paul's word and work, well abreast of modern scholarship."—*Inquirer.*

OUR FATHER

(SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co. 2s. 6d. net.)

"For the practice of the Lord's Prayer we do not know a better or more encouraging volume."—*Expository Times.*

"This little book is as full of thought and as eloquent in expression as we should expect from its gifted author."—*Spectator.*

* The *Old Testament and Modern Research* and *Oremus* are out of print.

'A triumphant and unqualified success. Indispensable to ministers and Bible students.'—Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D.

NOW COMPLETE.

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

Edited by J. HASTINGS, D.D.

In Two Volumes. Price per Vol., in cloth binding, 21s. net; in half-morocco, gilt top, 26s. net.

The purpose of this Dictionary is to give an account of everything that relates to Christ—His Person, Life, Work, and Teaching.

It is first of all a preacher's Dictionary. Its authors are scholars as well as preachers.

The articles are all new. Even when their titles are the same as the titles of articles in the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' they are written by new men, and with a new purpose.

The articles are not limited even to the Bible, but gather together whatever touches Christ in all the history and experience of the Church.

It is called a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, because it includes everything that the Gospels contain, whether directly related to Christ or not. Its range, however, is far greater than that of the Gospels. It seeks to cover all that relates to Christ throughout the Bible and in the life and literature of the world. There are articles on the Patristic estimate of Jesus, the Mediæval estimate, the Reformation and Modern estimates. There are articles on Christ in the Jewish writings and in the Muslim literature. Much attention has been given to modern thought, whether Christian or anti-Christian. Every aspect of modern life, in so far as it touches or is touched by Christ, is described under its proper title.

It will be found that the contents of the Gospels, especially their spiritual contents, have never before been so thoroughly investigated and set forth.

Full Prospectus will be sent post free on application to the Publishers.

THE KINGDOM AND THE MESSIAH.

By Prof. ERNEST F. SCOTT, D.D., Author of "The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology." Post 8vo, **6s.** net.

"A new volume of conspicuous ability. . . . We desire to speak in the warmest terms of the excellent work contained in the volume. It merits, and will doubtless receive, the earnest attention of Biblical scholars."—*Methodist Times.*

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL QUESTION IN THE GOSPELS;

and other Studies in recent New Testament Criticism.

By Rev. CYRIL W. EMMET, M.A. Post 8vo, **6s.** net.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS.—The Eschatology of the Gospels as interpreted by Schweitzer—M. Loisy and the Gospel Story—M. Loisy's View of the Resurrection—Harnack on the Second Source of the First and Third Gospels—Should the Magnificat be ascribed to Elizabeth?—Galatians the Earliest of the Pauline Epistles—The Problem of the Apocalypse and its Bearing on the Conception of Inspiration.

"The busy clergyman, who has heard of Schweitzer and Loisy, but has no time to study their books at length, will find the essence of their respective positions given with clearness and with conspicuous fairness. He will also be enabled to estimate their views from the standpoint of a sane and judicious criticism. We have no space even to summarise Mr. Emmet's discussion. We would rather urge our readers to get the book and study it for themselves."—*Record.*

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MAN.

By Prof. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A. Post 8vo, **6s.** net.

"We know of no recent work which better enables us to see the spiritual, divine, and infinite content of human nature, the essential and abiding relation of man to the unseen and eternal, the indisputable fact of his freedom, even in a universe governed by supreme and majestic law."

Baptist Times.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. The

Religion of Revelation in its pre-Christian State of Development.

By Prof. HERMANN SCHULTZ, Göttingen. Second Edition. Two Volumes, 18s. net.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY; Or,

Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity according to the New Testament Sources.

By Prof. WILLIBALD BEYSCHLAG, D.D., Halle. Second Edition. Two Volumes, 18s. net.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

By Prof. HANS H. WENDT, D.D., Jena. Two Volumes, 21s.

'Dr. Wendt's work is of the utmost importance for the study of the Gospels, both with regard to the origin of them and to their doctrinal contents. It is a work of distinguished learning, of great originality, and of profound thought. The second part [now translated into English], which sets forth the contents of the doctrine of Jesus, is the most important contribution yet made to Biblical theology, and the method and results of Dr. Wendt deserve the closest attention.'—*Expositor.*

THE TRUTH OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

By Prof. JULIUS KAFTAN, Berlin. Two Volumes, 16s. net.

'Quite apart from the immediate question of obtaining a knowledge of the Ritschlian theology at first hand, these volumes are welcome. For Kaftan is no imitator, but a fertile and able writer. In the near future his view of theology, its essence and its accidents, will exercise a deep influence in our land.'—*Expository Times.*

JUSTIFICATION AND RECONCILIATION.

By ALBRECHT RITSCHL. Edited by Prof. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil., and Rev. A. B. MACAULAY, M.A. Second Edition. Price 14s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE LITERATURE

OF THEISM. Some Principal Types of Religious Thought. With Introductory and Explanatory Notes.

By Prof. ALFRED CALDECOTT, D.D., and Prof. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil. Second Edition. 7s. 6d. net.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Prof. JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., D.D., Author of "The Historical New Testament," etc. New Volume "International Theological Library." Second Edition. Post 8vo, **12s.**

"We express our heartiest thanks for a work which must for long be the only manual for English students and the basis for all their work on the subject."—Prof. JAMES DENNEY, D.D.

"I do not doubt that it will at once take its place as our standard work."—Prof. A. S. PEAKE, D.D.

"There is no other English book on the subject so comprehensive, and the reader, whether critic or student, will be impressed with the author's learning, lucid style, methodical arrangement, and reverent attitude."

Athenæum.

THE EARLIEST LIFE OF CHRIST:

Being the Diatessaron of Tatian.

By Rev. J. HAMLYN HILL, D.D. A popular Edition, with Introduction. **3s.** net.

Dr. Hamlyn Hill's larger edition, containing the valuable Appendices, has been out of print for some time. It is hoped that the low price at which this edition is now issued will enable many to place in their libraries a copy of one of the most interesting of early Christian writings.

"Absolutely necessary to every serious student of the Gospels. The publishers have therefore done us a real service in issuing a cheaper edition of it."—*Expository Times.*

VISIONS AND REVELATIONS.

Discourses on the Apocalypse.

By Rev. JOHN T. DEAN, M.A. Post 8vo, **5s.** net.

"A scholarly exposition of a difficult but fascinating subject. The historical and literary illustrations are drawn from a wide range of reading, and are both apt and illuminating."—*Scotsman.*

One thousand pages, with Maps.
In cloth binding . . 20s. net.
In half-leather . . . 25s. net.

Dictionary of the Bible.

COMPLETE IN ONE VOLUME.

Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

This Dictionary is entirely distinct from the Five-Volume Dictionary. *It is not based on any other Dictionary, but is a wholly new and original Work.*

Every Article is signed by the Author. This is the first time that all the Articles in a single-volume Dictionary of the Bible have been committed to Specialists and bear their signatures, as in the largest Dictionaries.

Complete Prospectus, with Specimen Pages, free.

'A very fine achievement, worthy to stand beside his larger Dictionaries, and by far the most scholarly yet produced in one volume in English-speaking countries, perhaps it may be said in the world.'—*Christian World.*

'An exceedingly valuable and comprehensive work.'—*Record.*

'Thoroughly abreast of present-day knowledge. For presentation and library purposes the book outstrips all its rivals, and its closely packed pages are a perfect mine for teachers and ministers.'—*Sunday School Chronicle.*

'To produce in a single volume a Dictionary of the Bible sufficiently ample in its scope and plan, abreast of present scholarship, not too elementary to be of use to students and ministers, and not too technical and scholastic in its method for an ordinary reader is, as will be readily understood, an extremely difficult undertaking. So far as our examination of it has gone, it has been admirably accomplished.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

THE

SHORT COURSE SERIES

EDITED BY THE

Rev. JOHN ADAMS, B.D.

THIS Series is designed to encourage a healthy reaction in the direction of expository preaching, but the appeal will not be restricted to ministers or preachers. The various volumes will meet the needs of laymen and Sunday School teachers who desire a scholarly, but also practical, exposition of Bible history and doctrine. It will be the constant aim of the various contributors to make "The Short Course Series" one of the most convenient and valuable of Bible helps.

Price Two Shillings net per Volume.

VOLUMES NOW READY.

THE PSALM OF PSALMS.

By Prof. JAMES STALKER, D.D., Aberdeen.

"A rich exposition of the richest and most endearing of all the contents of the Psalter, the 23rd Psalm."—*Expository Times.*

A CRY FOR JUSTICE: A Study in Amos.

By Prof. J. E. MCFADYEN, D.D., Glasgow.

"Fascinatingly done, especially inspiring, this little book is to be highly commended. It is rich in suggestions."—*Biblical World.*

THE BEATITUDES.

By Rev. ROBERT H. FISHER, D.D., Edinburgh.

"We heartily commend this exposition, which shows a fine spiritual insight and refinement of thought and expression."—*Sunday School Chronicle.*

[See also following pages for list of volumes ready.

JEHOVAH-JESUS.

By Rev. THOMAS WHITELAW, D.D., Kilmarnock.

"Dr. Whitelaw devotes himself to the epithets linked with the divine name in the Old Testament—Jehovah-Jireh, Jehovah-Tsidkenu, and so forth—and derives from them many helpful and suggestive lessons."—*Scotsman.*

THE LENTEN PSALMS.

By the Editor.

"It is in every way a delightful combination of homiletic precision, devotional sympathy, and expository genius. Mr. Adams is to be warmly thanked for this gracious exposition of the Psalms of Sorrow."—*The Life of Faith.*

THE SONG AND THE SOIL.

By Prof. W. G. JORDAN, D.D., Kingston, Ontario.

"An admirable little book on the missionary idea in the Old Testament. The author combines expert scholarship with a gift for homiletic application."
Methodist Recorder.

THE SEVENFOLD "*I AM.*"

By Rev. THOMAS MARJORIBANKS, B.D., Edinburgh.

"A succession of discourses which are of real merit—cultured and thoughtful, and always happy in the new lights they bring to bear on the texts under consideration."—*Scotsman.*

THE HIGHER POWERS OF THE SOUL.

By Rev. GEORGE M'HARDY, D.D., Kirkcaldy.

"It shows how conscience, reason, memory, and other powers may be cultivated under the guidance and inspiration of Christ. The book ought to be a great help to thoughtful and earnest young Christians. It breaks fresh ground, and does it well."—*Preacher's Magazine.*

THE MAN AMONG THE MYRTLES: A Study in Zechariah's Visions.

By the Editor.

"A sound and scholarly and at the same time popular piece of exposition, which will be valued by preachers and teachers alike."—*Scotsman.*

IN THE UPPER ROOM.

By Rev. D. J. BURRELL, D.D., LL.D., New York.

"This volume well sustains the excellence of this valuable series, which should help to restore expository preaching to its former place in the pulpit."
British Congregationalist.

Volumes now ready—continued.

A MIRROR OF THE SOUL: Studies in the Psalter.
By Rev. Canon VAUGHAN, M.A., Winchester.

THE STORY OF JOSEPH.
By Prof. ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., Theol.D., Edinburgh.

THE DIVINE DRAMA OF JOB.
By Rev. CHARLES F. AKED, D.D., San Francisco.

The following volumes are in Preparation.

SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF DAVID.
By Prof. H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., Edinburgh.

THE PROPHECY OF MICAH.
By Principal A. J. Tait, M.A., Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

THE EXPOSITORY VALUE OF THE REVISED VERSION.
By Prof. G. Milligan, D.D., University of Glasgow.

A PREFACE TO THE GOSPEL: An Exposition of Isaiah 55.
By Rev. A. Smellie, D.D., Carluke.

THE SON OF MAN.
By Prof. Andrew C. Zenos, D.D., Chicago.

READINGS IN THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.
By Prof. W. Emery Barnes, D.D., Cambridge.

THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.
By Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D., New College, London.

Volumes in Preparation—continued.

BELIEF AND LIFE: Expositions in the Fourth Gospel.
By Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

THE EMOTIONS OF JESUS.
By Prof. Robert Law, D.D., Toronto.

THE OVERTURES OF JESUS.
By Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D., Brooklyn.

THE SEVEN WORDS FROM THE CROSS.
By Rev. A. B. Macaulay, M.A., Stirling.

THE PRAYERS OF ST. PAUL.
By Prof. W. G. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Toronto.

THE METAPHORS OF ST. PAUL.
By Rev. A. Boyd Scott, B.D., Glasgow.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.
By Rev. F. Stuart-Gardiner, B.D., Kingstown, Ireland.

THE REDEMPTION OF GOD.
By Prof. T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D., Toronto.

STUDIES IN THE APOCALYPSE.
By Prof. W. T. Davison, D.D., Richmond.

EXPOSITORY STUDIES.
By Prof. Arthur S. Peake, D.D., Manchester.

SOCIAL STUDIES.
By Rev. Canon Simpson, M.A., D.D., St. Paul's, London.

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.
STATIONERS' HALL, LONDON.
London Agents: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & Co. LTD.